This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

15

Gift of

George Cassell

STANFORD
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

Junius Finally Discovered

BY

WILLIAM H. GRAVES, L.B.
ΘΔX

BIRMINGHAM
ALABAMA

"EUREKA"

To the Reviewer:

In case you write any comment or criticism on this book, I will be very much obliged if you would mail copy of your article to

W. H. GRAVES,
701 First National Bank Bldg.,
Birmingham, Ala.

Junius Finally Discovered

BY

WILLIAM H. GRAVES, L.B.
ΘΔΧ

BIRMINGHAM
ALABAMA

"EUREKA"

SP

DA
P3G

COPYRIGHT, 1917
BY
W. H. GRAVES

FROM THE PRESS OF THE
DISPATCH PRINTING COMPANY
BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

PREFACE

IN the preparation of this discussion I have thought best to make liberal quotations from the writings of "JUNIUS," SIR PHILIP FRANCIS, and from those of the person whom I conceive to be the real author of the "JUNIUS LETTERS," whose name I will disclose in a subsequent part of this volume. I have made these quotations solely for the benefit and convenience of my readers, in order to save them the trouble and expense of collecting quite a number of books on the subject, most of which are now out of print and very difficult to procure. It has taken me quite a while to get these books into my possession, and at considerable pains and expense to me, most of them having to be imported from London, where they were written and published; but I consider that I have been amply repaid, as they have enabled me to investigate this abstruse question in all of its phases, which, otherwise, I could not have done. The reader being furnished with these quotations for ready use and inspection, will be able to compare the different styles, sentiments, political opinions, etc., of these writers, the aims and objects which they had in view, and in this manner to draw his own conclusion upon the subject.

I hope that my readers will observe that almost every proposition laid down by me is sustained by facts, and by history, in which the books and pages are cited. That I rarely volunteer an opinion of my own, unless it is amply supported by historical facts, or corroborated by well-known authors and able critics. If the reader will examine the books of Mr. Taylor and H. R. Francis, frequently referred to in this discussion, wherein they contend that Sir Philip Francis was the author of the "Junius Letters," he will discover that almost every one of their propositions is founded upon their own opinions, surmises and conjectures, without any facts or history to sustain them; the reason why, is very evident: there were no facts or history in existence which tended to prove their contention. It is impossible to prove a fact which does not exist.

I have also inserted the opinions of several eminent literary critics on this controversy, in order that my readers may compare them with those expressed by me. If my views shall merit and receive the approbation of those who may follow me through this discussion, I shall feel fully compensated for the pains and labor which I have bestowed upon this book, regardless of the expense of its publication.

THE AUTHOR.

DEDICATION

As a tribute to the THOMAS PAINE NATIONAL HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, which has achieved so much towards perpetuating the name of the patriotic author of the "Common Sense" and "The Crisis" pamphlets, which were written and published by him just before and during the dark days of the American Revolution, I dedicate this volume.

The first suggestion ever made to the American Colonies to assert and fight for their emancipation from the tyrannical oppression of Great Britain appeared in these pamphlets, which outlined the principles finally incorporated in the Declaration of Independence, and which eventually resulted in the achievement by the Colonies of the inestimable blessings of Liberty.

PART I

JUNIUS FINALLY DISCOVERED

in the person of a very talented Englishman who fought with the Americans in the Revolutionary War.

PART I.—JUNIUS

DOUBTLESS no literary enigma has ever perplexed the minds of so many eminent literary critics as the authorship of the celebrated Junius Letters. Sir Harris Nicholas, an eminent writer, says in his "Analysis" of the subject: "The extraordinary interest which the community has taken in this question, has given birth to at least one hundred volumes or pamphlets, besides numerous essays and letters in magazines and newspapers;" and that a "great and universal curiosity is still felt to know who wrote the Letters."

About forty persons have been suggested by the friends of eminent writers as the author of these wonderful letters, and all have been successfully eliminated from the contest for the honor, in one way and another, by very profound critics, except Sir Philip Francis; and still, up to the present date, the riddle has never been solved. "*Stat nominis umbra.*"

If the reader will acquit me of egotism, I believe that I can and will unravel the mystery to his entire satisfaction, provided he does not expect me to produce positive proof from Junius himself that he disclosed his real name; which proof has never yet been made, according to all writers on the subject.

On the 21st day of January, 1769, the first one of the authentic political letters of Junius appeared in the "Public Advertiser," a newspaper owned and published by Henry Sampson Woodfall, in the city of London, England, and the last one appeared in the same paper on the 21st day of January, 1772, covering a priod of exactly three years. These remarkable letters were written from time to time, being forty-seven in number, written over the signature "Junius." Seven were written over the signature "Philo Junius," who was really Junius, being another name assumed

by him, under which he defended himself. These letters, with four written by Sir William Draper, one by Mr. Horne, and a few others, were revised and corrected by Junius, and presented by him to his publisher, Mr. Woodfall, and were published by him under the name of "Woodfall's Junius."

Besides these, Junius wrote quite a number of "Miscellaneous Letters," and many "Private Letters" to Mr. Woodfall; also a few over the names "Lucius" and "Atticus"; possibly one over the name "Brutus," which last three are generally considered to have been written by Junius.

All of the foregoing letters can be found in two volumes in Bohn's Standard Library, under the name of "Junius by Woodfall," which were compiled by him from all the writings of Junius, which he had in his possession; to which the reader is referred, if he wishes to get all the writings of Junius. Bohn's Standard Library Edition of Junius is used by me in this discussion.

Almost from the very beginning of his letters he assumed the fictitious name of "Junius," for which he had a most excellent reason, to which I will hereafter allude. He started out by saying: "I am the sole depositary of my own secret [his name] and it shall perish with me," which resolution I think he kept to the last; except, that he may have given his publisher, Mr. Woodfall, a hint as to his identity, this being a necessity for carrying on his voluminous correspondence with him, as I will show in a subsequent part of the subject.

In order that the reader may know something of the personality of this mysterious author, his style, sentiments, doctrines, politics, and advice given, I will here insert his "Dedication to the English Nation":

"DEDICATION TO THE ENGLISH NATION"

> "I dedicate to you a collection of letters, written by one of yourselves, for the common benefit of us all. They would never have grown to this size without your continued encouragement and applause. To me they originally owe nothing, but a healthy sanguine constitution. Under *your* care they have thriven. To *you*

they are indebted for whatever strength or beauty they possess. When kings and ministers are forgotten, when the force and direction of personal satire is no longer understood, and when measures are only felt in their remotest consequences, this book will, I believe, be found to contain principles worthy to be transmitted to posterity. When you leave the unimpaired, hereditary freehold to your children, you do but half your duty. Both liberty and property are precarious, unless the possessors have sense and spirit enough to defend them. This is not the language of vanity. If I am a vain man, my gratification lies within a narrow circle. I am the sole depositary of my own secret, and it shall perish with me. If an honest man, and, I may truly affirm, a laborious zeal for the public service, has given me any weight in your esteem, let me exhort and conjure you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by, without a determined, persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, today is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy. Be assured that the laws, which protect us in our civil rights, grow out of the constitution, and that they must fall or flourish with it. This is not the cause of faction, or of party, or of any individual, but the common interest of every man in Britain. Although the King should continue to support his present system of government, the period is not very distant at which you will have the means of redress in your own power. It may be nearer, perhaps, than any of us expect, and I would warn you to be prepared for it. The King may possibly be advised to dissolve the present Parliament a year or two before it expires of course, and precipitate a new election, in hopes of taking the nation by surprise. If such a measure be in agitation, this very caution may defeat or prevent it.

"I cannot doubt that you will unanimously assert the freedom of election, and vindicate your exclusive right to choose your representatives. But other questions have been started, on which your determination should be equally clear and unanimous. Let it be impressed upon your minds, let it be instilled into your children, that the liberty of the press is the *palladium*

of all the civil, political, and religious rights of an Englishman, and that the right of juries to return a general verdict, in all cases whatsoever, is an essential part of our constitution, not to be controlled or limited by the judges, nor in any shape questionable by the legislature. The power of King, Lords, and Commons is not an arbitrary power. They are the trustees, not the owners, of the estate. The fee-simple is in US. They cannot alienate, they cannot waste. When we say that the legislature is *supreme* we mean that it is the highest power known to the constitution; that it is the highest in comparison with the other subordinate powers established by the laws. In this sense, the word *supreme* is relative, not absolute. The power of the legislature is limited, not only by the general rules of natural justice and the welfare of the community, but by the forms and principles of our particular constitution. If this doctrine be not true, we must admit that King, Lords and Commons have no rule to direct their resolutions, but merely their own will and pleasure. They might unite the legislative and executive power in the same hands, and dissolve the constitution by an Act of Parliament. But I am persuaded you will not leave it to the choice of seven hundred persons, notoriously corrupted by the Crown, whether seven millions of their equals shall be freemen or slaves. The certainty of forfeiting their own rights, when they sacrifice those of the nation, is no check to a brutal, degenerate mind. Without insisting upon the extravagant concession made to Henry the Eighth, there are instances in the history of other countries, of a formal, deliberate surrender of the public liberty into the hands of the sovereign. If England does not share the same fate, it is because we have better resources than in the virtue of either House of Parliament.

"I said that the liberty of the press is the *palladium* of all your rights, and that the right of juries to return a general verdict is part of your constitution. To preserve the whole system, you must correct your legislature. With regard to any influence of the constituent over the conduct of the representative, there is little difference between a seat in Parliament for seven years and a seat for life. The prospect of your resentment is too remote, and although the last session of a septennial Parliament be usually employed in courting the

favour of the people, consider that, at this rate, your representatives have six years for offense, and but one for atonement. A death-bed repentance seldom reaches to restitution. If you reflect that in the changes of administration which have marked and disgraced the present reign, although your warmest patriots have, in their turn, been invested with the lawful and unlawful authority of the Crown, and though other reliefs or improvements have been held forth to the people, yet that no one man in office ever promoted or encouraged a bill for shortening the duration of Parliament, but that (whoever was minister) the opposition to this measure, ever since the septennial act passed, has been constant and uniform on the part of government—you can not but conclude, without the possibility of a doubt, that long Parliaments are the foundation of the undue influence of the Crown. This influence answers every purpose of arbitrary power to the Crown, with an expense and oppression to the people, which would be unnecessary in an arbitrary government. The best of our ministers find it the easiest and most compendious mode of conducting the King's affairs; and all ministers have a general interest in adhering to a system, which of itself is sufficient to support them in office, without any assistance from personal virtue, popularity, labor, abilities, or experience. It promises every gratification to avarice and ambition, and secures impunity. These are truths unquestionable. If they make no impression, it is because they are too vulgar and notorious. But the inattention or indifference of the nation has continued too long. You are roused at last to a sense of your danger. The remedy will soon be in your power.

"If Junius lives, you shall often be reminded of it. If, when the opportunity presents itself, you neglect to do your duty to yourselves and to your posterity, to God and to your country, I shall have one consolation left, in common with the meanest and basest of mankind: Civil liberty may still last the life of JUNIUS."

From a perusal of his political writings, it is evident that he had a fixed and settled purpose in mind from the beginning, which I will concisely state, according to my own opinion:

At the time when he wrote his first letters, under the names of "Lucius" and "Atticus," and also when he wrote

should be thirty years.

his first letter as Junius, the political situation of England was in a deplorable condition. The Government had recently emerged from a seven-years' war with France, and was overwhelmingly in debt. Spain had also been giving England considerable trouble about the Falkland Islands. George the Third had recently become King; he was young and inexperienced, being only about fifteen years old when the first Junius Letter was written; consequently, his mother, the Princess Dowager of Wales, was Regent until the young King attained his majority. She was governed almost entirely by Lord Bute, then Prime Minister of England. He and the Queen Regent had the tutelage of the young King in their own hands, and moulded his character and political opinions after their own notions, which were on a very selfish and arbitrary line; besides, history informs us that he was, by no means, an intellectual character, which frequently showed itself during his reign.

He was often influenced by bad men in the Ministry, to suit their evil purposes; all of which made the King, when he entered the throne, and his Ministry, very unpopular with the people, and caused them to be very restless under the Government. He continued Lord Bute as Prime Minister, and was under his baneful influence, owing to his inexperience in governmental affairs. Lord Bute selected a weak and inefficient Ministry to suit his own selfish purposes. The Parlament was, at that time, mostly composed of men of very poor ability, very venal in their characters, each looking out for his own private interests, utterly ignoring the good of the Government and the people at large.

A treaty of peace was about to be concluded with France, which was very unfair to England, and which Lord Bute, with his great personal influence over the King, the Ministry and Parliament, succeeded in getting through and ratified. It has been said in history that the Prime Minister was bribed by France for his influence in concluding the treaty.

These grievances, and others of a similar nature, exasperated the people against Lord Bute and the entire Govern-

ment, and made them very restless for a change of officials; he became very obnoxious to the entire Whig Party, among whom were Lords Chatham, Temple, Rockingham, Calcraft and others, who were then either in the Ministry or in Parliament; and, although in the minority, were quite a power to be reckoned with; so that Lord Bute resigned on April 8, 1763. He was succeeded by Lord Grenville as Prime Minister, who inaugurated a very bitter contest against the celebrated John Wilkes, who had been elected to Parliament by an overwhleming majority from London and Middlesex County over a Mr. Luttrell, and succeeded in ousting him from his seat and placing in his stead the person whom he defeated.

This was regarded as a high-handed piece of lawlessness, directly violative of the constitution. Wilkes entered the contest at the next election, and was chosen by the people by a still larger majority; but was again rejected by the House of Commons. He was re-elected three times by the people of Middlesex County, and was three times rejected by the Parliament.

This exasperated the people more than ever, and also the Whig party. They all considered that Wilkes had been persecuted by Parliament, and without a shadow of law or reason for the iniquity. Lord Grenville also had the odious Stamp Act passed in March, 1765, heavily taxing the American Colonies, which spread general dissatisfaction among those people, as well as great discontent in England. Thereupon, the King dismissed the entire Grenville Ministry, and appointed the Marquis of Rockingham as Prime Minister, with an entirely new Ministry, which repealed the Stamp Act in June 1767, but soon this Ministry came to an end, by internal dissensions and treachery among themselves.

In August, the Earl of Chatham, the great leader of the Whig Party, was placed at the head of the Ministry, but many of the other members were not in harmony with him, which caused violent dissensions among them. The King had not failed to put in the Ministry some of his favorites, to represent his views.

Shortly thereafter, a new bill for taxing the American Colonies was secretly put through Parliament by Lord Townshend, without consulting Lord Chatham, who had been sick, and was, part of the time, absent from the Ministry, and at variance with a majority of them; they, well knowing his violent opposition to the Act, passed it through during his absence.

This Act placed a heavy duty on tea, among other things, which exasperated the Colonies very much, and asserted the right in England to tax them in any way she chose.

Against this procedure, the Colonies openly rebelled, and on the arrival of the first cargo of tea, at Boston, the citizens boarded the vessel and threw the tea overboard.

Shortly thereafter, Lord Chatham resigned as Prime Minister, which broke up the Ministry. The Duke of Grafton was then appointed as Prime Minister with an entirely new Ministry, known as the Grafton Ministry, which was even worse than any of its predecessors.

It was composed of strong adherents of the King, and bitter enemies of the Colonies; as the question of American taxation was at that time, a very vital issue. This critical juncture of affairs gave birth to the Junius Letters.

About this time, Junius, the great political gladiator, appears upon the stage, and published the first of his celebrated Philippics, in which, he openly and boldly espoused the cause of the American Colonies, warning the Government of Great Britain that if it persisted in its course, it would bring on a revolution among the Colonies, which it finally did.

At the same time he directed a very caustic and severe criticism against the King, the Ministry and the Parliament, but especially against the Duke of Grafton, who was the principal object of his denunciation, which struck terror and consternation to the minds of them all. They well knew the powerful effect it would have upon the people, who were already in a state of unrest and suspicion. His open and avowed purpose was to overthrow the hated and despised

Grafton Ministry, dissolve the Parliament; and some writers say, to dethrone the King, but I do not agree with them in the last proposition, as it is not hinted at in any of his writings. My idea is that, in the overthrow of the Ministry and the dissolution of Parliament, he hoped and expected greatly to improve the condition of the Government by making it more liberal and republican in form, and in this wise to ameliorate the condition of the people.

In order that the reader may be able to comprehend the situation more fully, and understand the main object and purpose of his attack, I will here insert a copy of his first Letter:

LETTER I

TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER

January 21, 1769

"SIR:

The submission of a free people to the executive authority of Government is no more than a compliance with laws which they themselves have enacted. While the national honour is firmly maintained abroad, and while justice is impartially administered at home, the obedience of the subject will be voluntary, cheerful, and I might almost say, unlimited. A generous nation is grateful even for the preservation of its rights, and willingly extends the respect due to the office of a good prince into an affection for his person. Loyalty in the heart and understanding of an Englishman, is a rational attachment to the guardian of the laws. Prejudices and passion have sometimes carried it to a criminal length; and whatever foreigners may imagine, we know that Englishmen have erred as much in a mistaken zeal for particular persons and families, as they ever did in defence of what they thought most dear and interesting to themselves.

"It naturally fills us with resentment, to see such a temper insulted, or abused. In reading the history of a free people, whose rights have been invaded, we are interested in their cause. Our own feelings tell us how long they ought to have submitted, and at what moment it would have been treachery to themselves not to have

resisted. How much warmer will be our resentment, if experience should bring the fatal example home to ourselves!

"The situation of this country is alarming enough to arouse the attention of every man who pretends to a concern for the public welfare. Appearances justify suspicion, and when the safety of a nation is at stake, suspicion is a just ground of inquiry. Let us enter into it with candor and decency. Respect is due to the station of Ministers; and, if a resolution must at last be taken, there is none so likely to be supported with firmness, as that which has been adopted with moderation.

"The ruin of prosperity of a state depends so much upon the administration of its Government, that to be acquainted with the merit of a Ministry, we need only to observe the condition of the people.

"If we see them obedient to the laws, prosperous in their industry, united at home and respected abroad, we may reasonably presume that their affairs are conducted by men of experience, abilities and virtue. If, on the contrary, we see an universal spirit of distrust and dissatisfaction, a rapid decay of trade, dissensions in all parts of the Empire, and a total loss of respect in the eyes of foreign powers, we may pronounce, without hesitation, that the Government of that country is weak, distracted and corrupt. The multitude, in all countries, are patient to a certain point. Ill usage may rouse their indignation, and hurry them into excesses, but the original fault is in Government. Perhaps there never was an instance of a change in the circumstances and temper of a whole nation so sudden and extraordinary as that which the misconduct of Ministers has, within these very few years, produced in Great Britain. When our gracious Sovereign ascended the throne, we were a flourishing and contented people. If the personal virtues of the King could have insured the happiness of his subjects, the scene could not have altered so entirely as it has done. The idea of uniting all parties, of trying all characters, and distributing the offices of state by rotation, was gracious and benevolent to an extreme, though it has not yet produced the many salutary effects which were intended by it. To say nothing of the wisdom of such a plan, it undoubtedly arose from an unbounded goodness of heart, in which folly had no share. It was not a capricious partiality to new faces; it was

not a natural turn for low intrigue; nor was it the treacherous amusement of double and triple negotiations. No, sir, it arose from a continued anxiety, in the purest of all possible hearts, for the general welfare. Unfortunately for us, the event has not been answerable to the design. After a rapid succession of changes we are reduced to the state which hardly any change can mend. Yet there is no extremity of distress, which of itself ought to reduce a great nation to despair. It is not the disorder, but the physician; it is not a casual concurrence of calamitous circumstances; it is the pernicious hand of Government, which alone can make a whole people desperate.

"Without much political sagacity, or any extraordinary depth of observation, we need only mark how the principal departments of the state are bestowed, and look no farther for the true cause of every mischief that befalls us.

"The finances of a nation, sinking under its debts and expenses, are committed to a young nobleman [the Duke of Grafton] already ruined by play. Introduced to act under the auspices of Lord Chatham, and left at the head of affairs by that nobleman's retreat, he became Minister by accident; but, deserting the principles and professions which gave him a moment's popularity, we see him, from every honourable engagement to the public, an apostate by design. As for business, the world yet knows nothing of his talents or resolution; unless a wayward, wavering inconsistency be a mark of genius, and caprice a demonstration of spirit. It may be said, perhaps, that it is his Grace's province, as surely as it is his passion, rather to distribute than to save the public money; and that while Lord North is Chancellor of the Exchequer, the first Lord of the Treasury may be as thoughtless and as extravagant as he pleases. I hope, however, he will not rely too much on the fertility of Lord North's genius for finance. His Lordship is yet to give us the first proof of his abilities. It may be candid to suppose that he has hitherto voluntarily concealed his talents; intending, perhaps, to astonish the world, when we least expect it, with a knowledge of trade, a choice of expedients, and a depth of resources equal to the necessities, and far beyond the hopes of his country. He must now exert the whole power of his capacity, if he would wish us to forget, that, since he

has been in office, no plan hass been formed, no system adhered to, nor any one important measure adopted for the relief of public credit. If his plan for the service of the current year be not irrevocably fixed on, let me warn him to think seriously of consequences before he ventures to increase the public debt. Outraged and oppressed as we are, this nation will not bear, after a six years' peace, to see new millions borrowed, without an eventual diminution of debt, or reduction of interest. The attempt might rouse a spirit of resentment which might reach beyond the sacrifice of a Minister. As to the debt upon the civil list, the people of England expect that it will not be paid without a strict inquiry how it was incurred. If it must be paid by Parliament, let me advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer to think of some better expedient than a lottery. To support an expensive war, or in circumstances of absolute necessity, a lottery may perhaps be allowable; but, besides that it is at all times the very worst way of raising money upon the people, I think it ill becomes the royal dignity to have the debts of a King provided for, like the repairs of a county bridge, or a decayed hospital. The management of the King's affairs in the House of Commons cannot be more disgraced than it has been. A leading Minister repeatedly called down for absolute ignorance, ridiculous motions ridiculously withdrawn—deliberate plans disconcerted, and a week's preparation of graceful oratory lost in a moment,—give us some, though not adequate ideas, of Lord North's parliamentary abilities and influence. Yet before he had the misfortune to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was neither an object of derision to his enemies, nor of melancholy pity to his friends.

"A series of inconsistent measures had alienated the Colonies from their duty as subjects, and from their natural affection to their common country. When Mr. Grenville was placed at the head of the Treasury, he felt the impossibility of Great Britain's supporting such an establishment as her former successes had made indispensable, and at the same time of giving any sensible relief to foreign trade, and to the weight of the public debt. He thought it equitable that those parts of the Empire which had benefited most by the expenses of the war, should contribute something to the expenses of the peace, and he had no doubt of the constitutional

right vested in Parliament to raise that contribution. But, unfortunately for his country, Mr. Grenville was at any rate to be distressed, because he was Minister; and Mr. Pitt and Lord Camden were to be the patrons of America, because they were in opposition. Their declaration gave spirit and argument to the Colonies; and while perhaps they meant no more than the ruin of a minister, they in effect divided one half of the Empire from the other. Under one administration, the Stamp Act is made; under the second, it is repealed; under the third, in spite of all experience, a new mode of taxing the Colonies is invented, and a question revived which ought to have been buried in oblivion. In these circumstances, a new office is established for the business of the plantations, and the Earl of Hillsborough called forth, at a most critical season, to govern America. The choice at least announced to us a man of superior capacity and knowledge. Whether he be so or not, let his dispatches, as far as they have appeared, let his measures, as far as they have operated, determine for him. In the former we have seen strong assertions without proof, declamation without argument, and violent censures without dignity or moderation; but neither correctness in the composition, nor judgment in the design. As for his measures, let it be remembered, that he was called upon to conciliate and unite; and that, when he entered into office, the most refractory of the Colonies were still disposed to proceed by the constitutional methods of petition and remonstrance. Since that period they have been driven into excesses little short of rebellion. Petitions have been hindered from reaching the throne; and the continuance of one of the principal assemblies rested upon an arbitrary condition, which, considering the temper they were in, it was impossible they should comply with; and which would have availed nothing as to the general question if it had been complied with. So violent, and I believe I may call it, so unconstitutional an exertion of the prerogative, to say nothing of the weak, injudicious terms in which it was conveyed, gives us as humble an opinion of his lordship's capacity as it does of his temper and moderation. While we are at peace with other nations, our military force may perhaps be spared to support the Earl of Hillsborough's measures in America. Whenever that force shall be necessarily withdrawn or diminished,

the dismission of such a Minister will neither console us for his imprudence nor remove the settled resentment of a people, who, complaining of an Act of the Legislature, are outraged by an unwarrantable stretch of prerogative; and, supporting their claims by argument, are insulted with declamation.

"Drawing lots would be a prudent and reasonable method of appointing the officers of state compared to a late disposition of the Secretary's office. Lord Rochford was acquainted with the affairs and temper of the southern courts—Lord Weymouth was equally qualified for either department. By what unaccountable caprice has it happened, that the latter, who pretends to no experience whatsoever, is removed to the most importtant of the two departments, and the former by preference placed in an office where his experience can be of no use to him? Lord Weymouth had distinguished himself in his first employment by a spirited, if not judicious, conduct. He had animated the civil magistrate beyond the tone of civil authority, and had directed the operations of the army to more than military execution. Recovered from the errors of his youth, from the distraction of play, and the bewitching smiles of Burgundy, behold him exerting the whole strength of his clear, unclouded faculties, in the service of the Crown. It was not the heat of midnight excesses, nor ignorance of the laws, nor the furious spirit of the House of Bedford. No, sir, when this respectable Minister interposed his authority between the magistrate and the people, and signed the mandate on which, for aught he knew, the lives of thousands depended, he did it from the deliberate motion of his heart, supported by the best of his judgment.

"It has lately been a fashion to pay a compliment to the bravery and generosity of the Commander-in-chief [Lord Granby] at the expense of his understanding. They who love him least make no question of his courage, while his friends dwell chiefly on the facility of his disposition. Admitting him to be as brave as a total absence of all feeling and reflection can make him, let us see what sort of merit he derives from the remainder of his character. If it be generosity to accumulate in his own person and family a number of lucrative employments—to provide, at the public expense, for every creature that bears the name of Manners [Granby's

name], and, neglecting the merit and services of the rest of the army, to heap promotions upon his favourites and dependants—the present Commander-in-chief is the most generous man alive. Nature has been sparing of her gifts to this noble lord; but, where birth and fortune are united, we expect the noble pride and independence of a man of spirit, not the servile, humiliating complaisance of a courtier. As to the goodness of his heart, if a proof of it be taken from the facility of never refusing, what conclusions shall we draw from the indecency of never performing? And if the discipline of the army be in any degree preserved, what thanks are due to a man, whose cares, notoriously confined to filling up vacancies, have degraded the office of commander-in-chief into a broker of commissions!

"With respect to the navy, I shall only say, that this country is so highly indebted to Sir Edward Hawke, that no expense should be spared to secure to him an honourable and affluent retreat.

"The pure and impartial administration of justice is, perhaps the firmest bond to secure a cheerful submission of the people, and to engage their affections to Government. It is not sufficient that questions of private right or wrong are justly decided, nor that judges are superior to the vileness of pecuniary corruption. Jefferies himself, when the court had no interest, was an upright judge. A court of justice may be subject to another sort of bias, more important and pernicious, as it reaches beyond the interest of individuals, and affects the whole community. A judge under the influence of Government, may be honest enough in the decision of private causes, yet a traitor to the public. When a victim is marked out by the Ministry, this judge [Lord Mansfield] will offer himself to perform the sacrifice. He will not scruple to prostitute his dignity, and betray the sanctity of his office, whenever an arbitrary point is to be carried for Government, or the resentments of a court are to be gratified.

"These principles and proceedings, odious and contemptible as they are, in effect are no less injudicious. A wise and generous people are roused by every appearance of oppressive, unconstitutional measures, whether those measures are supported openly by the power of government, or masked under the forms of a court of justice. Prudence and self-preservation will oblige the

most moderate dispositions to make common cause, even with a man whose conduct they censure, if they see him [Wilkes] persecuted in a way which the real spirit of the laws will not justify. The facts, on which these remarks are founded, are too notorious to require an application.

"This, sir, is the detail. In one view, behold a nation overwhelmed with debt; her revenues wasted, her trade declining; the affections of her colonies alienated; the duty of the magistrate transferred to the soldiery; a gallant army, which never fought unwillingly but against their fellow-subjects, mouldering away for want of the direction of a man of common abilities and spirit; and in the last instance, the administration of justice becomes odious and suspected to the whole body of the people.

"This deplorable scene admits of but one addition—that we are governed by counsels from which a reasonable man can expect no remedy but poison; no relief but death.

"If, by the immediate interposition of Providence, it were possible for us to escape a crisis so full of terror and despair, posterity will not believe the history of the present time. They will either conclude that our distresses were imaginary, or that we had the good fortune to be governed by men of acknowledged integrity and wisdom; they will not believe it possible that their ancestors could have survived, or recovered from so desperate a condition, while a duke of Grafton was Prime Minister, a Lord North Chancellor of the Exchequer, a Weymouth and a Hillsborough Secretaries of State, a Granby Commander-in-chief, and a Mansfield chief criminal judge of the Kingdom.

JUNIUS."

Several other letters of a similar kind followed in quick succession against the Duke of Grafton and other members of the Ministry. The allusion to the Marquis of Granby, the Commander-in-chief of the King's army, is particularly noticeable, as Junius's object seemed to have been to get a man who was not hostile to his purposes. In his assault on the Marquis, he brought forward many of his short-comings as Commander-in-chief.

Sir William Draper, an officer in the King's service, and a well educated man, came to the rescue of the Marquis, by writing a very severe letter in reply to Junius, as an *anonymous* writer, which was answered by Junius in very caustic terms, in which he reviewed the official and private life of Sir William, which was not very savory in its nature. It was answered by him in a very subdued tone, and apologetic manner, which indicated that he was badly embarrassed in explaining some of his official acts.

Junius replied to this letter in a very severe manner, and I will call the reader's attention to the bitter irony in his succeeding letters:

LETTER III

TO SIR WILLIAM DRAPER, KNIGHT OF THE BATH

February 7th, 1769

"SIR:

Your defense of Lord Granby does honour to the goodness of your heart. You feel, as you ought to do, for the reputation of your friend, and you express yourself in the warmest language of your passions. In any other cause I doubt not, you would have cautiously weighed the consequences of committing your name to the licentious discourses and malignant opinions of the world. But here, I presume, you thought it would be a breach of friendship to lose one moment in consulting your understanding; as if an appeal to the public were no more than a military *coup de main*, where a brave man has no rules to follow but the dictates of his courage. Touched with your generosity, I freely forgive the excesses into which it has led you; and, far from resenting those terms of reproach which, considering that you are an advocate for decorum, you have heaped upon me rather too liberally, I place them to the account of an honest, unreflecting indignation, in which your cooler judgment and natural politeness had no concern. I approve of the spirit with which you have given your name to the public; and, if it were a proof of anything but spirit, I should have thought myself bound to follow your example. I should have hoped that even *my* name might carry some authority with it, if I had

not seen how very little weight or consideration a printed paper receives even from the respectable signature of Sir William Draper.

"You begin with a general assertion, that writers, such as I am, are the real cause of all the public evils we complain of. And do you really think, Sir William, that the licentious pen of a political writer is able to produce such important effects? A little calm reflection might have shown you that national calamities do not arise from the description, but from the real character and conduct of Ministers. To have supported your assertion, you should have proved that the present Ministry are unquestionably the *best and brightest* characters of the kingdom; and that, if the affections of the Colonies have been alienated, if Corsica has been shamefully abandoned, if commerce languishes, if public credit is threatened with a new debt, and your own Manilla ransom most dishonourably given up, it has all been owing to the malice of political writers, who will not suffer the best and brightest characters (meaning still the present Ministry) to take a single right step for the honour or interest of the nation. But it seems you were a little tender of coming to particulars. Your conscience insinuated to you that it would be prudent to leave the characters of Grafton, North, Hillsborough, Weymouth, and Mansfield to shift for themselves; and truly, Sir William, the part *you have* undertaken is at least as much as you are equal to.

"Without disputing Lord Granby's courage, we are yet to learn in what articles of military knowledge nature has been so very liberal to his mind. If you have served with him, you ought to have pointed out some instances of able disposition and well-concerted enterprise which might fairly be attributed to his capacity as a general. It is you, Sir William, who make your friend appear awkward and ridiculous, by giving him a laced suit of tawdry qualifications, which nature never intended him to wear.

"You say he has acquired nothing but honour in the field. Is the Ordnance nothing? Are the Blues nothing? Is the command of the army, with all the patronage annexed to it, nothing? Where he got all these *nothings*, I know not; but you, at least, ought to have told us where he deserved them.

"As to his bounty, compassion, etc., it would have been but little to the purpose, though you had approved

all that you have asserted. I meddle with nothing but his character as Commander-in-chief; and though I acquit him of the baseness of selling commissions, I still assert that his military cares have never extended beyond the disposal of vacancies; and I am justified by the complaints of the whole army, when I say, that, in this distribution, he consults nothing but parliamentary interest, or the gratification of his immediate dependants. As to his servile submission to the reigning Ministry, let me ask whether he did not desert the cause of the whole army when he suffered Sir Jeffery Amherst to be sacrificed, and what share he had in recalling that officer to the service? Did he not betray the just interest of the army, in permitting Lord Percy to have a regiment? And does he not at this moment give up all character and dignity as a gentleman, in receding from his own repeated declarations in favour of Mr. Wilkes?

"In the two next articles, I think we are agreed. You candidly admit, that he often makes such promises as it is a virtue in him to violate, and that no man is more assiduous to provide for his relations at the public expense. I did not urge the last as an absolute vice in his disposition, but to prove that a *careless, disinterested spirit* is no part of his character: and as to the other, I desire it may be remembered, that *I* never descended to the indecency of inquiring into his *convivial hours*. It is you, Sir William Draper, who have taken pains to represent your friend in the character of a drunken landlord, who deals out his promises as liberally as his liquor, and will suffer no man to leave his table either sorrowful or sober. None but an intimate friend, who must frequently have seen him in these unhappy, disgraceful moments, could have described him so well.

"The last charge, of the neglect of the army, is indeed the most material of all. I am sorry to tell you, Sir William, that in this article, your first fact is false; and as there is nothing more painful to me than to give a direct contradiction to a gentleman of your appearance, I could wish that, in your future publications, you would pay a greater attention to the truth of your premises, before you suffer your genius to hurry you to a conclusion. Lord Ligonier *did not* deliver the army (which you, in classical language, are pleased to call a *palladium*) into Lord Granby's hands. It was taken from him much against his inclination, some two or

three years before Lord Granby was a Commander-in-chief. As to the state of the army, I should be glad to know where you have received your intelligence. Was it in the rooms at Bath, or at your retreat at Clifton? The reports of reviewing generals comprehend only a few regiments in England, which, as they are immediately under the royal inspection, are perhaps in some tolerable order. But do you know anything of the troops in the West Indies, the Mediterranean, and North America, to say nothing of a whole army absolutely ruined in Ireland? Inquire a little into facts, Sir William, before you publish your next panegyric upon Lord Granby, and, believe me, you will find there is a fault at headquarters, which even the acknowledged care and abilities of the Adjutant-general cannot correct.

"Permit me now, Sir William, to address myself personally to you, by way of thanks for the honour of your correspondence. You are by no means undeserving of notice; and it may be of consequence, even to Lord Granby, to have it determined, whether or no the man who has praised him so lavishly, be himself deserving of praise. When you returned to Europe, you zealously undertook the cause of that gallant army by whose bravery at Manilla your own fortune had been established. You complained, you threatened, you even appealed to the public in print. By what accident did it happen, that in the midst of all this bustle, and all these clamours for justice to your injured troops, the name of the Manilla ransom was suddenly buried in a profound, and, since that time, an uninterrupted, silence? Did the Ministry suggest any motive to you strong enough to tempt a man of honour to desert and betray the cause of his fellow-soldiers? Was it that blushing ribband, which is now the perpetual ornament of your person? Or was it that regiment, which you afterwards (a thing unprecedented among soldiers) sold to Colonel Gisborne? Or was it that Government, the full pay of which you are contented to hold, with the half-pay of an Irish Colonel? And do you now, after a retreat not very like that of Scipio, presume to intrude yourself, unthought of, uncalled for, upon the patience of the public? Are your flatteries of the Commander-in-chief directed to another regiment, which you may again dispose of on the same honourable terms? We know your prudence, Sir William, and I should be sorry to stop your preferment. JUNIUS."

In Vol. I of Bohn's Edition, pp. 126, 129, 221 and 228, Junius wrote four other masterly letters in reply to Sir William Draper, which are well worth the perusal of any one; but I have not the space to reproduce them here. Their severity is almost beyond imitation. They must have made Sir William writhe in every nerve of his body. The invectives which Junius employed are scarcely surpassed by those of Cicero against *Cataline*, *Anthony*, or *Verres*. Let us take, for example, the beautiful rhetorical climax used by the great Roman orator, in his celebrated speech against Cataline: "*Abiit, Evasit, Excessit, Erupit,*" when the bold conspirator, smarting under the attack, madly dashed out of the Senate; and we will find that it is hardly superior to some of the invectives used by Junius against Sir William Draper, the Duke of Grafton, Lord Barrington, Lord Mansfield and Lord North. I quote the above Latin expression from memory.

This practically ended the controversy, with a great victory for Junius.

The Marquis of Granby resigned his office as Commander-in-chief of the army, shortly afterward. It has been said that he requested Sir William Draper not to write any more letters to Junius in his defense. Junius then addressed a letter to the Duke of Grafton, which I will here copy, in order that the reader may have a clear conception of its tenor, and the object for which it was written:

LETTER XV

TO HIS GRACE, THE DUKE OF GRAFTON

July 8th, 1769

"My Lord:

If nature had given you an understanding qualified to keep pace with the wishes and principles of your heart, she would have made you, perhaps, the most formidable Minister that ever was employed under a limited monarch, to accomplish the ruin of a free people. When neither the feelings of shame, the reproaches of conscience, nor the dread of punishment, form any bar

to the designs of a Minister, the people would have too much reason to lament their condition, if they did not find some resource in the weakness of his understanding. We owe it to the bounty of Providence, that the completest depravity of the heart is sometimes strangely united with a confusion of the mind, which counteracts the most favourite principles and makes the same man treacherous without art, and a hypocrite without deceiving. The measures, for instance, in which your Grace's activity has been chiefly exerted, as they were adopted without skill, should have been conducted with more than common dexterity. But truly, my Lord, the execution has been as gross as the design. By one decisive step you have defeated all the arts of writing. You have fairly confounded the intrigues of opposition, and silenced the clamours of faction. A dark, ambiguous system might require and furnish the materials of ingenious illustration; and, in doubtful measures, the virulent exaggeration of party must be employed to rouse and engage the passions of the people. You have now brought the merits of your administration to an issue, on which every Englishman of the narrowest capacity may determine for himself. It is not an alarm to the passions, but a calm appeal to the judgment of the people upon their own most essential interests. A more experienced Minister would not have hazarded a direct invasion of the first principles of the constitution before he had made some progress in subduing the spirit of the people. With such a cause as yours, my Lord, it is not sufficient that you have the court at your devotion, unless you can find means to corrupt or intimidate the jury. The collective body of the people form that jury, and from *their* decision there is but one appeal.

"Whether you have talents to support you at a crisis of such difficulty and danger, should long since have been considered. Judging truly of your disposition, you have, perhaps, mistaken the extent of your capacity. Good faith and folly have so long been received as synonymous terms, that the reverse of the proposition has grown into credit, and every villain fancies himself a man of abilities. It is the apprehension of your friends, my Lord, that you have drawn some hasty conclusion of this sort, and that a partial reliance upon your moral character has betrayed you beyond the depth of your understanding. You have now carried things too far

to retreat. You have plainly declared to the people what they are to expect from the continuance of your administration. It is time for your Grace to consider what you also may expect in return from *their* spirit and *their* resentment.

"Since the accession of our most gracious Sovereign to the throne we have seen a system of government which may well be called a reign of experiments. Parties of all denominations have been employed and dismissed. The advice of the ablest men in this country has been repeatedly called for and rejected; and when the royal displeasure has been signified to a Minister, the marks of it have usually been proportioned to his abilities and integrity. The spirit of the FAVOURITE [Lord Bute] had some apparent influence upon every administration; and every set of Ministers preserved an appearance of duration as long as they submitted to that influence. But there were certain services to be performed for the favourite's security, or to gratify his resentments, which your predecessors in office had the wisdom or the virtue not to undertake. The moment this refractory spirit was discovered, their disgrace was determined.

"Lord Chatham, Mr. Grenville, and Lord Rockingham have successively had the honour to be dismissed for preferring their duty as servants of the public, to those compliances which were expected from their station. A submissive administration was at last gradually collected from the deserters of all parties, interests, and connections; and nothing remained but to find a leader for these gallant well-disciplined troops. Stand forth, my Lord, for thou art the man. Lord Bute found no resource of dependence or security in the proud imposing superiority of Lord Chatham's abilities, the shrewd, inflexible judgment of Mr. Grenville, nor in the mild but determined integrity of Lord Rockingham. His views and situation required a creature void of all these properties; and he was forced to go through every division, resolution, composition, and refinement of political chemistry, before he happily arrived at the *caput mortuum* of vitriol in your Grace. Flat and insipid in your retired state, but, brought into action, you become vitriol again. Such are the extremes of alternate indolence or fury which have governed your whole administration.

Your circumstances with regard to the people soon becoming desperate, like other honest servants you determined to involve the best of masters in the same difficulties with yourself. We owe it to your Grace's well-directed labours, that your Sovereign has been persuaded to doubt of the affections of his subjects, and the people to suspect the virtues of their Sovereign at a time when both were unquestionable.

"You have degraded the royal dignity into a base, dishonourable competition with Mr. Wilkes, nor had you abilities to carry even this last contemptible triumph over a private man, without the grossest violation of the fundamental laws of the constitution and rights of the people. But these are rights, my Lord, which you can no more annihilate than you can the soil to which they are annexed. The question no longer turns upon points of national honour and security abroad or on the degrees of expedience and propriety of measures at home. It was not inconsistent that you should abandon the cause of liberty in another country, which you had persecuted in your own; and in the common arts of domestic corruption, we miss no part of Sir Robert Walpole's system except his abilities. In this humble imitative line, you might have proceeded, safe and contemptible. You might, probably, never have risen to the dignity of being hated, and even have been despised with moderation. But it seems you meant to be distinguished; and, to a mind like yours, there was no other road to fame but by the destruction of a noble fabric, which you thought had been too long the admiration of mankind. The use you have made of the military force introduced an alarming change in the mode of executing the laws. The arbitrary appointment of Mr. Luttrell invades the foundation of the laws themselves, as it manifestly transfers the right of legislation from those whom the people have chosen, to those whom they have rejected.

"With a succession of such appointments we may soon see a House of Commons collected, in the choice of which the other towns and counties of England will have as little share as the devoted county of Middlesex.

"Yet, I trust, your Grace will find that the people of this country are neither to be intimidated by violent measures, not deceived by refinements. When they see Mr. Luttrell seated in the House of Commons by mere

dint of power, and in direct opposition to the choice of a whole county, they will not listen to those subtleties by which every arbitrary exertion of authority is explained into the law and privilege of Parliament. It requires no persuasion of argument, but simply the evidence of the senses, to convince them that to transfer the right of election from the collective to the representative body of the people, contradicts all those ideas of a House of Commons which they have received from their forefathers, and which they have already, though vainly perhaps, delivered to their children. The principles on which this violent measure has been defended have added scorn to injury, and forced us to feel that we are not only oppressed, but insulted.

"With what force, my Lord, with what protection, are you prepared to meet the united detestation of the people of England? The City of London has given a generous example to the Kingdom in what manner a king of this country ought to be addressed; and, I fancy, my Lord, it is not yet in your courage to stand between your Sovereign and the addresses of his subjects. The injuries you have done this country are such as demand not only redress but vengeance. In vain shall you look for protection to that venal vote which you have already paid for—another must be purchased; and to save a Minister, the House of Commons must declare themselves not only independent of their constituents, but the determined enemies of the constitution. Consider, my Lord, whether this be an extremity to which their fears will permit them to advance, or, if *their* protection should fail you, how far you are authorized to rely upon the sincerity of those smiles which a pious court lavishes without reluctance upon a libertine by profession. It is not, indeed, the least of the thousand contradictions which attend you, that a man, marked to the world by the grossest violation of all ceremony and decorum, should be the first servant of a court in which prayers are morality and kneeling a religion.

"Trust not too far to appearances by which your predecessors have been deceived, though they have not been injured. Even the best of princes may at last discover that this is a contention in which everything may be lost, but nothing can be gained; and, as you became Minister by accident, were adopted without

choice, trusted without confidence, and continued without favour, be assured that, whenever an occasion presses, you will be discarded without even the forms of regret. You will then have reason to be thankful if you are permitted to retire to that seat of learning which, in contemplation of the system of your life, the comparative purity of your manners with those of their high steward, and a thousand other recommending circumstances, has chosen you to encourage the growing virtue of their youth, and to preside over their education.

"Whenever the spirit of distributing prebends and bishoprics shall have departed from you, you will find that learned seminary perfectly recovered from the delirium of an installation, and, what in truth it ought to be, once more a peaceful scene of slumber and thoughtless meditation. The venerable tutors of the university will no longer distress your modesty by proposing you for a pattern to their pupils. The learned dullness of declamation will be silent; and even the venal muse, though happiest in fiction, will forget your virtues. Yet, for the benefit of the succeeding age, I could wish that your retreat might be deferred until your morals shall happily be ripened to that maturity of corruption, at which the worst examples cease to be contagious.

JUNIUS."

Here I will copy his celebrated *Letter to the King*, for the convenience of my readers. There is a great deal of adroitness in this letter, in the way he approaches and flatters the King to accomplish his purpose, that is, to induce him to remove the odious Grafton Ministry:

LETTER XXXV

FOR THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER

December 19, 1769

"When the complaints of a brave and powerful people are observed to increase in proportion to the wrongs they have suffered, when instead of sinking into submission, they are roused to resistance, the time will soon arrive, at which every inferior consideration must yield to the security of the Sovereign, and to the general safety of the state.

"There is a moment of difficulty and danger at which flattery and falsehood can no longer deceive, and simplicity itself can no longer be misled. Let us *suppose* it *arrived*. Let us suppose a gracious, well-intentioned prince, made sensible at last of the great duty he owes to his people, and of his own disgraceful situation—that he looks round him for assistance, and asks for no advice but how to gratify the wishes and secure the happiness of his subjects. In these circumstances, it may be matter of curious SPECULATION to consider if an honest man were permitted to approach a King, in what terms he would address himself to his Sovereign. Let it be *imagined*, no matter how improbable, that the first prejudice against his character is removed, that the ceremonious difficulties of an audience are surmounted, that he feels himself animated by the purest and most honourable affections to his King and country, and that the great person whom he addresses has spirit enough to bid him speak freely, and understanding enough to listen to him with attention. Unacquainted with the vain impertinence of forms, he would deliver his sentiments with dignity and firmness, but not without respect.

" 'Sir: It is the misfortune of your life, and originally the cause of every reproach and distress which has attended your Government, that you should never have been acquainted with the language of truth, until you heard it in the complaints of your people. It is not, however, too late to correct the error of your education. We are still inclined to make an indulgent allowance for the pernicious lessons you received in your youth, and to form the most sanguine hopes from the natural benevolence of your disposition. We are far from thinking you capable of a direct, deliberate purpose to invade those original rights of your subjects, on which all their civil and political liberties depend. Had it been possible for us to entertain a suspicion so dishonourable to your character, we should long since have adopted a style of remonstrance very distant from the humility of complaint. The doctrine inculcated by our laws, *That the King can do no wrong*, is admitted without reluctance. We separate the amiable, good-natured prince from the folly and treachery of his servants, and the private virtues of the man from the vices of his Government. Were it not for this just distinction, I

know not whether your Majesty's condition or that of the English nation would deserve most to be lamented. I would prepare your mind for a favourable reception of truth by removing every painful, offensive idea of personal reproach. Your subjects, Sir, wish for nothing but that, as *they* are reasonable and affectionate enough to separate your person from your Government, so *you*, in your turn, should distinguish between the conduct which becomes the permanent dignity of a King and that which serves only to promote the temporary interest and miserable ambition of a Minister. You ascended the throne with a declared and, I doubt not, a sincere resolution of giving universal satisfaction to your subjects. You found them pleased with the novelty of a young prince whose countenance promised even more than words, and loyal to you not only from principle, but passion. It was not a cold profession of allegiance to the first magistrate, but a partial, animated attachment to a favourite prince, the native of their country. They did not wait to examine your conduct, nor to be determined by experience, but gave you a generous credit for the future blessings of your reign, and paid you in advance the dearest tribute of their affections. Such, Sir, was once the disposition of a people who now surround your throne with reproaches and complaints. Do justice to yourself. Banish from your mind those unworthy opinions with which some interested persons have laboured to possess you. Distrust the man who tells you that the English are naturally light and inconstant—that they complain without a cause, Withdraw your confidence equally from all parties—from ministers, favourites, and relations, and let there be one moment in your life in which you have consulted your own understanding.

" 'When you affectedly renounced the name of Englishman, believe me, Sir, you were persuaded to pay a very ill-judged compliment to one part of your subjects at the expense of another. While the natives of Scotland are not in actual rebellion, they are undoubtedly entitled to protection: nor do I mean to condemn the policy of giving some encouragement to the novelty of their affections for the house of Hanover. I am ready to hope for everything from their new-born zeal, and from the future steadiness of their allegiance. But hitherto *they* have no claim to your favour. To honour

them with a determined predilection and confidence, in exclusion of your English subjects who placed your family, and in spite of treachery and rebellion, have supported it, upon the throne, is a mistake too gross even for the unsuspecting generosity of youth. In this error we see a capital violation of the most obvious rules of policy and prudence. We trace it, however, to an original bias in your education, and are ready to allow for your inexperience.

" 'To the same early influence we atrribute it, that you have descended to take a share not only in the narrow views and interests of particular persons, but in the fatal malignity of their passions. At your accession to the throne the whole system of Government was altered not from wisdom or deliberation, but because it had been adopted by your predecessor. A little personal motive of pique and resentment was sufficient to remove the ablest servants of the Crown; but it is not in this country, Sir, that such men can be dishonoured by the frowns of a King. They were dismissed, but could not be disgraced. Without entering into a minuter discussion of the merits of the peace, we may observe, in the imprudent hurry with which the first overtures from France were accepted, in the conduct of the negotiation, and terms of the treaty, the strongest marks of that precipitate spirit of concession, with which a certain part of your subjects have been at all times ready to purchase a peace with the *natural enemies of this country*. On *your* part we are satisfied that everything was honourable and sincere, and if England was sold to France, we doubt not that your Majesty was equally betrayed. The conditions of the peace were matter of grief and surprise to your subjects, but not the immediate cause of their present discontent.

" 'Hitherto, Sir, you have been sacrificed to the prejudices and passions of others. With what firmness will you bear the mention of your own?

" 'A man not very honourably distinguished in the world, commences a formal attack upon your favourite, considering nothing but how he might best expose his person and principles to detestation, and the national character of his countrymen to contempt. The natives of that country [Scotland], Sir, are as much distinguished by a peculiar character as by your Majesty's favour. Like another chosen people, they have been conducted

into the land of plenty, where they find themselves effectually marked, and divided from mankind. There is hardly a period at which the most irregular character may not be redeemed. The mistakes of one sex find a retreat in patriotism; those of the other in devotion. Mr. Wilkes brought with him into politics the same liberal sentiments by which his private conduct had been directed, and seemed to think that as there are few excesses in which an English gentleman may not be permitted to indulge, the same latitude was allowed him in the choice of his political principles, and in the spirit of maintaining them. I mean to state, not entirely to defend, his conduct. In the earnestness of his zeal he suffered some unwarrantable insinuations to escape him. He said more than moderate men could justify, but not enough to entitle him to the honour of your Majesty's personal resentment. The rays of royal indignation collected upon him served only to illuminate, and could not consume. Animated by the favour of the people on one side, and heated by persecution on the other, his views and sentiments changed with his situation. Hardly serious at first, he is now an enthusiast. The coldest bodies warm with opposition, the hardest sparkle in collision. There is a holy mistaken zeal in politics as well as religion. By persuading others, we convince ourselves. The passions are engaged, and create a material affection in the mind, which coerces us to love the cause for which we suffer. Is this a contention worthy of a King? Are you not sensible how much the meanness of the cause gives an air of ridicule to the serious difficulties into which you have been betrayed? The destruction of one man [Wilkes] has been now for many years the sole object of your Government; and if there can be anything still more disgraceful, we have seen for such an object the utmost influence of the executive power and every ministerial artifice exerted without success. Nor can you ever succeed, unless *he* should be imprudent enough to forfeit the protection of those laws to which you owe your crown, or unless your Ministers should persuade you to make it a question of force alone, and try the whole strength of Government in opposition to the people. The lessons *he* has received from experience, will probably guard him from such excess of folly, and in your Majesty's virtues we find an unquestionable assurance that no illegal violence will be attempted.

" 'Far from suspecting you of so horrible a design, we would attribute the continued violation of the laws, and even this last enormous attack upon the vital principles of the constitution, to an ill-advised, unworthy personal resentment. From one false step you have been betrayed into another, and as the cause was unworthy of you, your Ministers were determined that the prudence of the execution should correspond with the wisdom and dignity of the design. They have reduced you to the necessity of choosing out of a variety of difficulties, to a situation so unhappy, that you can neither do wrong without ruin, nor right without affliction.

" 'These worthy servants have undoubtedly given you many singular proofs of their abilities. Not contented with making Mr. Wilkes a man of importance, they have judiciously transferred the question from the rights and interests of one man, to the most important rights and interests of the people, and forced your subjects from wishing well to the cause of an individual, to unite with him in their own. Let them proceed as they have begun and your Majesty need not doubt that the catastrophe will do no dishonour to the conduct of the piece.

" 'The circumstances to which you are reduced will not admit of a compromise with the English nation. Undecisive, qualifying measures will disgrace your Government still more than open violence, and without satisfying the people, will excite their contempt. They have too much understanding and spirit to accept of an indirect satisfaction for a direct injury. Nothing less than a repeal as formal as the resolution itself, can heal the wound which has been given to the constitution, nor will anything less be accepted. I can readily believe that there is an influence sufficient to recall that pernicious vote. The House of Commons undoubtedly consider their duty to the Crown as paramount to all other obligations. To us they are only indebted for an accidental existence, and have justly transferred their gratitude from their parents to their benefactors; from those who gave them birth, to the Minister from whose benevolence they derive the comforts and pleasures of their political life, who has taken the tenderest care of their infancy, and relieves their necessities, without offending their delicacy. But, if it were possible for their integrity to be degraded to a condition so vile and abject

that, compared with it, the present estimation they stand in, is a state of honour and respect, consider, Sir, in what manner you will afterwards proceed. Can you conceive that the people of this country will long submit to be governed by so flexible a House of Commons?

" 'It is not in the nature of human society that any form of government, in such circumstances, can long be preserved. In ours, the general contempt of the people is as fatal as their detestation. Such, I am persuaded, would be the necessary effect of any base concession made by the present House of Commons, and, as a qualifying measure would not be accepted, it remains for you to decide whether you will, at any hazard, support a set of men who have reduced you to this unhappy dilemma, or whether you will gratify the united wishes of the whole people of England by dissolving the Parliament.

" 'Taking it for granted, as I do very sincerely, that you have personally no design against the constitution, nor any views inconsistent with the good of your subjects, I think you cannot hesitate long upon the choice which it equally concerns your interest and your honour to adopt. On one side you hazard the affection of all your English subjects—you relinquish every hope of repose to yourself, and you endanger the establishment of your family for ever. All this you venture for no object whatsoever, or for such an object as it would be an affront to you to name. Men of sense will examine your conduct with suspicion, while those who are incapable of comprehending to what degree they are injured, afflict you with clamours equally insolent and unmeaning. Supposing it possible that no fatal struggle should ensue, you determine at once to be unhappy, without the hope of a compensation either from interest or ambition. If an English King be hated or despised, he *must* be unhappy; and this, perhaps, is the only political truth which he ought to be convinced of without experiment. But if the English people should no longer confine their resentment to a submissive representation of their wrongs—if, following the glorious example of their ancestors, they should no longer appeal to the creature of the constitution, but to that high Being who gave them the rights of humanity, whose gifts it were sacrilege to surrender—let me ask you, Sir, upon what part of your subjects would you rely for assistance?

" 'The people of Ireland have been uniformly plundered and oppressed. In return, they give you every day fresh marks of their resentment. They despise the miserable Governor you have sent them, because he is the creature of Lord Bute; nor is it from any natural confusion in their ideas that they are so ready to confound the original of a King with the disgraceful representation of him.

" 'The distance of the Colonies would make it impossible for them to take an active concern in your affairs, if they were as well affected to your Government as they once pretended to be to your person. They were ready enough to distinguish between *you* and your Ministers. They complained of an act of the legislature but traced the origin of it no higher than to the servants of the Crown; they pleased themselves with the hope that their Sovereign, if not favourable to their cause, at least was impartial. The decisive, personal part you took against them, has effectually banished that first distinction from their minds. They consider you as united with your servants against America, and know how to distinguish the Sovereign and a venal Parliament on one side, from the real sentiments of the English people on the other. Looking forward to independence, they might possibly receive you for their King; but if you ever retire to America, be assured they will give you such a covenant to digest as the Presbytery of Scotland would have been ashamed to offer to Charles the Second. They left their native land in search of freedom, and found it in a desert. Divided as they are into a thousand forms of policy and religion, there is one point in which they all agree—they equally detest the pageantry of a King and the supercilious hypocrisy of a bishop.

" 'It is not then from the alienated affection of Ireland or America that you can reasonably look for assistance; still less from the people of England, who are actually contending for their rights, and in this great question are parties against you. You are not, however, destitute of every appearance of support—you have all the Jacobites, Non-jurors, Roman Catholics, and Tories of this country, and all Scotland, without exception. Considering from what family you are descended, the choice of your friends has been singularly directed; and truly, Sir, if you had not lost the Whig interest of

England, I should admire your dexterity in turning the hearts of your enemies. Is it possible for you to place any confidence in men who, before they are faithful to you, must renounce every opinion and betray every principle, both in Church and State which they inherit from their ancestors, and are confirmed in by their education? Whose numbers are so inconsiderable, that they have long since been obliged to give up the principles and language which distinguished them as a party, and to fight under the banners of their enemies? Their zeal begins with hypocrisy and must conclude in treachery. At first they deceive—at last they betray.

" 'As to the Scotch, I must suppose your heart and understanding so biased from your earliest infancy in their favour, that nothing less than *your own* misfortunes can undeceive you. You will not accept of the uniform experience of your ancestors; and when once a man is determined to believe, the very absurdity of the doctrine confirms him in his faith. A bigoted understanding can draw a proof of attachment to the house of Hanover, from a notorious zeal for the house of Stuart, and find an earnest of future loyalty in former rebellions. Appearances are, however, in their favour; so strongly indeed, that one would think they had forgotton that you are their lawful King, and had mistaken you for a pretender to the Crown. Let it be admitted, then, that the Scotch are as sincere in their present professions as if you were in reality not an Englishman, but a Briton of the North. You would not be the first prince of their native country against whom they have rebelled, nor the first whom they have basely betrayed. Have you forgotten, Sir, or has your favourite concealed from you, that part of our history, when the unhappy Charles (and he too had private virtues) fled from the open, avowed indignation of his English subjects, and surrendered himself at discretion to the good faith of his own countrymen? Without looking for support in their affections as subjects, he applied only to their honour, as gentlemen, for protection. They received him, as they would your Majesty, with bows, and smiles, and falsehood, and kept him, until they had settled their bargain with the English Parliament; then basely sold their native King to the vengeance of his enemies. This, Sir, was not the act of a few traitors, but the deliberate treachery of a Scotch Parliament representing the nation.

A wise prince might draw from it two lessons of equal utility to himself. On one side he might learn to dread the undisguised resentment of a generous people, who dare openly assert their rights, and who, in a just cause, are ready to meet their Sovereign in the field. On the other side, he would be taught to apprehend something far more formidable—a fawning treachery against which no prudence can guard, no courage can defend. The insidious smile upon the cheek would warn him of the canker in the heart.

" 'From the uses to which one part of the army has been too frequently applied, you have some reason to expect that there are no services they would refuse. Here, too, we trace the partiality of your understanding. You take the sense of the army from the conduct of the guards, with the same justice with which you collect the sense of the people from the representations of the Ministry. Your marching regiments, Sir, will not make the guards their example either as soldiers or subjects; they feel and resent, as they ought to do, that invariable, undistinguishing favour with which the guards are treated; while those gallant troops by whom every hazardous, every laborious service is performed, are left to perish in garrisons abroad, or pine in quarters at home, neglected and forgotten. If they had no sense of the great original duty they owe their country, their resentment would operate like patriotism, and leave your cause to be defended by those to whom you have lavished the rewards and honours of their profession. The Praetorian bands, enervated and debauched as they were, had still strength enough to awe the Roman populace; but when the distant legions took the alarm, they marched to Rome and gave away the Empire.

" 'On this side, then, which ever way you turn your eyes, you see nothing but perplexity and distress. You may determine to support the very Ministry who have reduced your affairs to this deplorable situation—you may shelter yourself under the forms of a parliament, and set your people at defiance. But be assured, Sir, that such a resolution would be as imprudent as it would be odious. If it did not immediately shake your establishment, it would rob you of your peace of mind for ever.

" 'On the other, how different is the prospect! How easy, how safe and honourable is the path before you!

The English nation declare they are grossly injured by their representatives, and solicit your Majesty to exert your lawful prerogative, and give them an opportunity of recalling a trust which, they find, has been scandalously abused. You are not to be told that the power of the House of Commons is not original, but delegated to them for the welfare of the people from whom they received it. A question of right arises between the constituent and the representative body. By what authority shall it be decided? Will your Majesty interfere in a question in which you have properly no immediate concern? It would be a step equally odious and unnecessary. Shall the Lords be called upon to determine the rights and privileges of the Commons? They cannot do it without a flagrant breach of the constitution. Or will you refer it to the judges? They have often told your ancestors that the law of Parliament is above them. What part then remains but to leave it to the people to determine for themselves? They alone are injured, and, since there is no superior power to which the cause can be referred, they alone ought to determine.

" 'I do not mean to perplex you with a tedious argument upon a subject already so discussed, that inspiration could hardly throw a new light upon it. There are, however, two points of view in which it particularly imports your Majesty to consider the late proceedings of the House of Commons. By depriving a subject of his birthright, they have attributed to their own vote an authority equal to an act of the whole legislature; and, though perhaps not with the same motives, have strictly followed the example of the Long Parliament, which first declared the regal office useless, and soon after, with as little ceremony, dissolved the House of Lords. The same pretended power which robs an English subject of his birthright may rob an English King of his crown. In another view, the resolution of the House of Commons, apparently not so dangerous to your Majesty, is still more alarming to your people. Not contented with divesting one man of his right, they have arbitrarily conveyed that right to another. They have set aside a return as illegal, without daring to censure those officers who were particularly apprized of Mr. Wilkes's incapacity; not only by the declaration of the House, but expressly by the writ

directed to them, and who, nevertheless, returned him as duly elected. They have rejected the majority of votes, the only criterion by which our laws judge of the sense of the people; they have transferred the right of election from the collective to the representative body; and, by these acts, taken separately or together, they have essentially altered the original constitution of the House of Commons. Versed as your Majesty undoubtedly is in the English history, it cannot easily escape you how much it is your interest, as well as your duty, to prevent one of the three estates from encroaching upon the province of the other two, or assuming the authority of them all. When once they have departed from the great constitutional line by which all their proceedings should be directed, who will answer for their future moderation? Or what assurance will they give you, that when they have trampled upon your equals, they will submit to a superior? Your Majesty may learn hereafter how nearly the slave and tyrant are allied.

" 'Some of your council, more candid than the rest, admit the abandoned profligacy of the present House of Commons, but oppose their dissolution upon an opinion, I confess, not very unwarrantable, that their successors would be equally at the disposal of the treasury. I cannot persuade myself that the nation will have profited so little by experience. But if that opinion were well founded, you might then gratify our wishes at an easy rate, and appease the present clamour against your Government, without offering any material injury to the favourite cause of corruption.

" 'You have still an honourable part to act. The affections of your subjects may still be recovered. But before you subdue *their* hearts you must gain a noble victory over your own. Discard those little personal resentments which have so long directed your public conduct. Pardon this man [Wilkes] the remainder of his punishment; and, if resentment still prevails, make it what it should have been long since—an act, not of mercy, but of contempt. He will soon fall back into his natural station—a silent senator, and hardly supporting the weekly eloquence of a newspaper. The gentle breath of peace would leave him on the surface neglected and unremoved. It is only the tempest that lifts him from his place.

" 'Without consulting your Minister, call together your whole council. Let it appear to the public that you can determine an act for yourself. Come forward to your people. Lay aside the wretched formalities of a King, and speak to your subjects with the spirit of a man, and in the language of a gentleman. Tell them you have been fatally deceived. The acknowledgment will be no disgrace, but rather an honour to your understanding. Tell them you are determined to remove every cause of complaint against your Government, that you will give your confidence to no man who does not possess the confidence of your subjects; and leave it to themselves to determine, by their conduct at a future election, whether or no it be in reality the general sense of the nation that their rights have been arbitrarily invaded by the present House of Commons, and the constitution betrayed. They will then do justice to their representatives and to themselves.

" 'These sentiments, Sir, and the style they are conveyed in, may be offensive, perhaps, because they are new to you. Accustomed to the language of courtiers, you measure their affections by the vehemence of their expressions; and, when they only praise you indirectly, you admire their sincerity. But this is not a time to trifle with your fortune. They deceive you, Sir, who tell you that you have many friends whose affections are founded upon a principle of personal attachment. The first foundation of friendship is not the power of conferring benefits, but the equality with which they are received and *may* be returned. The fortune which made you a King, forbade you to have a friend. It is a law of nature which cannot be violated with impunity. The mistaken prince who looks for friendship, will find a favourite, and in that favourite, the ruin of his affairs.

" 'The people of England are loyal to the house of Hanover, not from a vain preference of one family to another, but from a conviction that the establishment of that family was necessary to the support of their civil and religious liberties. This, Sir, is a principle of allegiance equally solid and rational; fit for Englishmen to adopt, and well worthy of your Majesty's encouragement. We cannot long be deluded by nominal distinctions. The name of Stuart, of itself, is only contemptible; armed with the sovereign authority, their

principles are formidable. The prince who imitates their conduct, should be warned by their example; and, while he plumes himself upon the security of his title to the crown, should remember that, as it was acquired by one revolution, it may be lost by another.'

JUNIUS."

The foregoing is a very powerful criticism of the Government. It was on account of the publication of this letter by Mr. Woodfall, that he was prosecuted by the Government, arrested and confined for some time in the Tower of London.

The Duke of Grafton was removed as Prime Minister, on the 28th of January, 1770, and Lord North was appointed by the King to succeed him. A new Ministry was formed by him of persons who were in harmony with him and the King.

Meanwhile, the Government was doing all in its power to find out who was the author of the Junius Letters, in order to arrest him, enter a prosecution against him, and punish him to the full extent of the law.

The King, the Ministry and the Parliament were trembling under his severe strictures, and the people were restless and discontented because of the mismanagement of the Government, which was then in a deplorable condition. The most violent speeches were made in Parliament by Edmund Burke, Lord North and others, against the author of those remarkable Letters. I will quote a part of the speech of *Mr. Burke*, in order that the reader may see the temper of Parliament against the mysterious Junius; but all that was done and said on the subject, did not result in the discovery of this vexatious writer.

Directing his remarks to Lord North, then Prime Minister, Edmund Burke, the acknowledged leader of the English Parliament, has this to say of Junius and his Letters, which were appearing in the "Public Advertiser": "How comes this Junius to have broke through the cobwebs of the law, and to range uncontrolled, unpunished through the land? The myrmidons of the court have been long, and are

still, pursuing him in vain . . . . But what will all their efforts avail? . . . . No sooner has he wounded one than he lays down another dead at his feet. For my part, when I saw his attack upon the King, I own my blood ran cold. I thought he had ventured too far, and there was an end of his triumphs, not that he had not asserted many truths—yes, sir, there are in that composition many bold truths, by which a wise prince might profit. It was the rancour and venom with which I was struck . . . . But while I expected, in his daring flight, his final ruin and folly, behold him rising still higher, and coming down *souse* upon both Houses of Parliament. Yes, he did make *you* his quarry, and *you* still bleed from the wounds of his talons. You crouched, and still crouch, beneath his rage. Nor has he dreaded the terrors of your brow. Sir, he has attacked even *you*—he has—and I believe you have no reason to triumph in the encounter. In short, after carrying away our Royal Eagle in his pounces, and dashing him against a rock, he has laid *you* prostrate—Kings, Lords, and Commons, are but the sport of his fury."

Shortly thereafter a very malignant prosecution was commenced by the Government against Mr. Woodfall, as the editor and proprietor of the "Public Advertiser," for publishing The Letter to the King, to which I have already alluded. The case was heard before Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, the Law Minister of the Crown, in the Court of King's Bench, at Guildhall; and, although he used all of his personal influence, and all the bias of his nature, in attempting to secure a verdict from the jury in favor of the Government, yet, very much to his chagrin, they brought in a verdict of "Guilty of Printing and Publishing *only*," which amounted almost to an acquittal.

Several motions were made by the Government to have the verdict amended, and entered up as a conviction against the defendant, but it was so very plain as to what the jury intended, that Lord Mansfield could not, with any propriety or self-respect, rule in favor of the motions to amend the verdict. Finally the prosecution was dropped. In the mean-

time, Mr. Woodfall was under arrest, and imprisoned in the Tower, which caused him great mental anguish, inconvenience and mortification during this trying ordeal, and he was put to heavy expense in making his defense to this wicked prosecution. But Junius stood firmly by him through all his troubles, aiding him liberally with money and advice; and all the while he was pouring volley after volley of "hot shot" into Lord Mansfield, the trial Judge, in his most powerful invectives, through the "Public Advertiser." He took up the conduct of the Court in all of its phases, exposing his one-sided charges to the jury in favor of the Government, showing his over-weening desire to convict the defendant. *Vide* Vol. I, page 305, and page 471, "Junius by Woodfall," to which the reader is referred, as it would take up too much space to insert them here.

Afterwards, Junius revised, corrected and compiled his political letters, with several others, and presented the copyright of the same to Mr. Woodfall, as he said, to somewhat compensate him for his sufferings and expenses incident to the wicked prosecution which the Government projected against him for publishing the "Letter to the King." No doubt this proceeding against Mr. Woodfall had a two-fold purpose. First, to punish him severely, and second, to find out, if possible, from him, who was the author of the Junius Letters, so that he could be arrested, and likewise, be sorely punished. But they made a signal failure in both; they did not succeed in compelling Mr. Woodfall to disclose the author's name, probably because he did not really know it, then. It was a very generous act on the part of Junius to give Mr. Woodfall the copyright to his Letters, as it doubtless enabled him to realize quite a little fortune from their publication. History says the book was sold in almost every portion of the civilized world.—Vol. I, p. 80 of Woodfall's Junius.

This was in keeping with the course which Junius always pursued in relation to all of his writings, even in his after life, to which I shall refer later on in this volume. He said that he did not write for profit, but for the *cause* and *the*

people. Had he written for the emoluments which would have accrued to him, he could doubtless have amassed a large fortune from the publication and sale of his works.

The appointment of Lord North to the head of the Ministry was a great disappointment to Junius, and to the entire *Whig party.* He and they hoped and expected that Lord Chatham, their boasted leader, would get the appointment, and that the Ministry would be composed principally of men belonging to their party, of known ability and integrity, which would have greatly improved the condition of affairs in the Government, and would have pacified the people. But he was not disheartened in the turn which things had taken. He summoned his best efforts to keep up the fight, and win over the King to their aid, in which he enlisted the Whig party to his support.

He vigorously kept up his correspondence in the "Public Advertiser," first attacking one, and then another of the Ministry of Lord North with his brilliant invectives, keeping them continually in a state of unrest and political excitement, hoping finally to improve the personality of the Ministry, and thereby help to relieve the condition of the people, whose welfare was always topmost with him. It is a well-known historical fact that he never sought any preferment for himself. He never seemed to have coveted wealth or position. He was always for the "cause" and "the people." On the fourteenth day of February, 1770, he wrote another very severe letter to the Duke of Grafton, who had recently been dismissed by the King from the head of the Ministry, seemingly to remind him, and the public of his former misdeeds, a copy of which letter is here inserted:

LETTER XXXVI

TO HIS GRACE, THE DUKE OF GRAFTON

February 14, 1770

"My Lord:

If I were personally your enemy, I might pity and forgive you. You have every claim to compassion that can arise from misery and distress. The condition you

are reduced to would disarm a private enemy of his resentment, and leave no consolation to the most vindictive spirit, but that such an object as you are would *disgrace* the *dignity* of *revenge*. But in the relation you have borne to this country, you have no title to indulgence; and if I had followed the dictates of my own opinion, I never should have allowed you the respite of a moment. In your public character you have injured every subject of the Enpire; and though an individual is not authorized to forgive the injuries done to society, he is called upon to assert his separate share in the public resentment. I submitted, however, to the judgment of men more moderate, perhaps more candid, than myself. For my own part, I do not pretend to understand those prudent forms of decorum, those gentle rules of discretion which some men endeavor to unite with the conduct of the greatest and most hazardous affairs. Engaged in the defense of an honourable cause, I would take a decisive part, I should scorn to provide for a future retreat, or to keep terms with a man who preserves no measures with the public. Neither the abject submission of deserting his post in the hour of danger, nor even the sacred shield of cowardice should protect him. I would pursue him through life, and try the last exertion of my abilities to *preserve* the *perishable infamy* of his name, and make it *immortal*.

"What then, my Lord, is the event of all the sacrifices you have made to Lord Bute's patronage and to your own unfortunate ambition? Was it for this you abandoned your earliest friendships—the warmest connections of your youth, and all those honourable engagements by which you once solicited, and might have acquired, the esteem of your country? Have you secured no recompense for such a waste of honour? Unhappy man! What party will receive the common deserter of all parties? Without a client to flatter, without a friend to console you, and with only one companion from the honest house of Bloomsbury, you must now retire into a dreadful solitude. At the most active period of life you must quit the busy scene and conceal yourself from the world if you would hope to save the wretched remains of a ruined reputation. The vices operate like age—bring on disease before its time, and in the prime of youth leave the character broken and exhausted.

"Yet your conduct has been mysterious as well as contemptible. Where is now that firmness or obstinacy so long boasted of by your friends and acknowledged by your enemies? We were taught to expect that you would not leave the ruin of this country to be completed by other hands, but were determined either to gain a decisive victory over the constitution, or to perish bravely at least behind the last dyke of the prerogative. You knew the danger and might have been provided for it. You took sufficient time to prepare for a meeting with your Parliament to confirm the mercenary fidelity of your dependants, and to suggest to your Sovereign a language suited to his dignity, at least, if not to his benevolence and wisdom. Yet, while the whole kingdom was agitated with anxious expectation upon one great point, you meanly evaded the question, and instead of the explicit firmness and decision of a king, gave us nothing but the misery of a ruined grazier, and the *whining piety of a Methodist.* We had reason to expect that notice would have been taken of the petitions which the King has received from the English nation; and although I can conceive some personal motives for not yielding to them, I can find none, in common prudence or decency, for treating them with contempt. Be assured, my Lord, the English people will not tamely submit to this unworthy treatment; they had a right to be heard; and their petitions, if not granted, deserved to be considered. Whatever be the real views and doctrine of a court, the Sovereign should be taught to preserve some forms of attention to his subjects, and if he will not redress their grievances, not to make them a topic of jest and mockery among lords and ladies of the bedchamber. Injuries may be atoned for and forgiven; but insults admit of no compensation. They degrade the mind in its own esteem, and force it to recover its level by revenge. This neglect of the petitions was, however, a part of your original plan of government, nor will any consequences it has produced account for your *deserting* your *Sovereign* in the midst of that distress in which you and your new friends had involved him. One would think, my Lord, you might have taken this spirited resolution before you had dissolved the last of those early connections which once, even in your own opinion, did honour to your youth; before you had obliged Lord Granby to quit a service he was attached to; before you

had discarded one chancellor and killed another. To what an abject condition have you laboured to reduce the best of princes, when the unhappy man who yields at last to such personal instance and solicitation as never can be fairly employed against a subject feels himself degraded by his compliance, and is unable to survive the disgraceful honours which his gracious Sovereign had compelled him to accept! He was a man of spirit, for he had a quick sense of shame, and death has redeemed his character. I know your Grace too well to appeal to your feelings upon this event; but there is another heart, not yet, I hope, quite callous to the touch of humanity, to which it ought to be a dreadful lesson for ever.

Now, my Lord, let us consider the situation to which you have conducted, and in which you have thought it advisable to abandon, your royal master. Whenever the people have complained and nothing better could be said in defence of the measures of government, it has been the fashion to answer us, though not very fairly, with an appeal to the private virtues of our Sovereign. "Has he not, to relieve the people, surrendered a considerable part of his revenue? Has he not made the judges independent by fixing them in their places for life?" My Lord, we acknowledge the gracious principle which gave birth to these concessions, and have nothing to regret but that it has never been adhered to. At the end of seven years, we are loaded with a debt of above five hundred thousand pounds upon the civil list, and we now see the Chancellor of Great Britain tyrannically forced out of his office, not for want of abilities, not for want of integrity, or of attention to his duty, but for delivering his honest opinion in Parliament upon the greatest constitutional question that has arisen since the revolution. We care not to whose private virtues you appeal; the theory of such a Government is falsehood and mockery; the practice is oppression. You have laboured then (though I confess to no purpose) to rob your master of the only plausible answer that ever was given in defence of his Government,—of the opinion which the people had conceived of his personal honour and integrity. The Duke of Bedford was more moderate than your Grace. He only forced his master to violate a solemn promise made to an individual. But you, my Lord, have successfully extended your advice to every political, every moral engagement,

"I believe, my Lord, I may now take my leave of you forever. You are no longer that resolute Minister who had spirit to support the most violent measures—who compensated for the want of great and good qualities by a brave determination (which some people admired and relied on) to maintain himself without them. The reputation of obstinacy and perseverance might have supplied the place of all the absent virtues. You have now added the last negative to your character, and meanly confessed that you are destitute of the common spirit of a man.

"Retire then, my Lord, and hide your blushes from the world; for with such a load of shame, even *black* may change its color. A mind such as yours, in the solitary hours of domestic enjoyment, may still find topics of consolation. You may find it in the memory of violated friendship; in the afflictions of an accomplished prince whom you have disgraced and deserted, and in the agitation of a great country driven by *your* counsels to the brink of destruction.

"The palm of ministerial firmness is now transferred to *Lord North.* He tells us so himself with the plenitude of the *ore rotundo*; and I am ready enough to believe that, while he *can* keep his place, he will not *easily* be *persuaded* to *resign* it. Your Grace was the firm Minister of yesterday; Lord North is the firm Minister of to-day. To-morrow, perhaps, his Majesty in his wisdom may give us a rival for you both. You are too well acquainted with the temper of your late allies to think it possible that Lord North should be permitted to govern this country. If we may believe common fame, they have shown him their superiority already. His Majesty is indeed too gracious to insult his subjects, by choosing his first Minister from among the domestics of the Duke of Bedford. That would have been too gross an outrage to the three kingdoms. Their purpose however, is equally answered by pushing forward this *unhappy* figure, and forcing it to bear the odium of measures which they in reality direct. Without immediately appearing to govern, they possess the power and distribute the emoluments of government as they think proper. They still adhere to the spirit of that calculation which made Mr. Luttrell representative of Middlesex. Far from regretting your retreat, they assure us very gravely that it increases the real strength of the

Ministry. According to this way of reasoning they will probably grow stronger and more flourishing every hour they exist; for I think there is hardly a day passes in which some one or other of his Majesty's servants does not leave them to improve by the loss of his assistance. But, alas! their countenances speak a different language. When the members drop off, the main body cannot be insensible of its approaching dissolution. Even the violence of their proceedings is a signal of despair. Like broken tenants, who have had warning to quit the premises, they curse their landlords, destroy the fixtures, throw everything into confusion, and care not what mischief they do to the estate.

JUNIUS."

Junius and the Whig Party finally succeeded in removing the worst element of the Ministry, and in the dissolution of Parliament, which was reformed by placing a better and more competent membership in their stead, and even the King became much more conservative than he formerly had been. All of these changes ameliorated the condition of things, considerably, and restored peace and harmony among the people of England, as well as tranquillity to the American Colonies; all of whom had become worn out under the operation of a very bad system of government. However, Junius and the Whig Party were not entirely satisfied with even this condition of affairs, but sought to make other reforms, by improving the personnel of the Ministry, as well as the Parliament.

History informs us that the condition of the Government had been so very much improved, that the people and their leaders had become reconciled by the improvement, and longed for tranquillity; therefore, they seemed to be willing to give up any further contention with the Government; and the Whig Party became lukewarm. However, Junius was disposed not to give up the fight, especially against Lord Mansfield, who was still in the Ministry, for reasons heretofore mentioned. He also paid his respects to Lord Hawke, Secretary of the King's Navy, ironically saying, among other things: "No expense should be spared to secure to him an

honourable and affluent retreat from office." Soon afterward, the Secretary resigned. He also made some very severe attacks on Lord Barrington, Secretary of War. In Private Letters, No. 61, Vol. II, he says: "Next to the Duke of Grafton, I verily believe that the blackest heart in the kingdom belongs to Lord Barrington."

It may be of interest to the reader to learn from whom Junius took his name. From all I can learn, it is more than probable that he took it from Lucius Junius Brutus, an eminent republican in Rome, who expelled the vile Tarquins from that city and country, on account of the foul indignity offered by Sextus Tarquinius to the helpless Lucretia, as well as for the other outrageous atrocities committed by them. He was also the founder of the Roman Republic. It is generally conceded that Junius was the author of a few other letters, under the names "Lucius" and "Atticus," and probably one under the name of "Brutus," before he commenced the Junius Letters. The name "Atticus" was probably taken from Atticus T. Pomponius, a highly educated Roman patrician, who was an intimate friend of Cicero and others of the notable men of Rome.

The foregoing letters are very similar, and I may say, almost identical in style, sentiment and doctrines with the Junius Letters. Possibly my readers would be interested to know the way in which Junius succeeded in concealing himself from discovery as the author of the Letters. I will recite some of them: In his Letter No. 5, to Mr. Woodfall, he says: "Whenever you have anything to communicate to me, let the hint be thus: '*C at the same place*, and direct to Mr. John Fretley [an assumed name], at the same Coffee House, where it is impossible I should be known.' "

In his tenth letter to Mr. Woodfall, he says: "As to me, be assured that it is not in the nature of things that they [the Cavendishes] or you, or anybody else should know me, unless I make myself known. All arts or inquiries would be equally ineffectual."

In his thirtieth letter to Mr. Woodfall, he writes about the celebrated actor, David Garrick, trying to find him out,

and scores him very severely for his impertinence. He says to Mr. Woodfall: "I must be more cautious than ever: I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days, or if I did, they would attaint me by bill." "Change to Somerset Coffee House, and let no mortal know the alteration. I am persuaded you are too honest a man to contribute, in any way, to my *destruction.* Act honourably by me, and at the proper time you shall know me."

He takes many other precautions to conceal his identity. He sent most of his letters by Penny Post, at other times by a chairman, or some obscure person. Occasionally he disguised himself and secretly delivered his letters to the office of Mr. Woodfall.

Mr. Woodfall generally addressed *his* letters to Junius, under the name of Mr. John Fretley, or Mr. William Middleton. In these different ways, Junius managed to conceal his personality from everybody; and, in my opinion, from all that I have read on the subject, no one ever found him out, except possibly Mr. Woodfall, his publisher, as it seems to me that it was almost impossible for him to have carried on their voluminous correspondence without being known to each other. Besides, as above stated, Junius told Mr. Woodfall that if he acted honorably by him he should know him at the proper time.

It is likely that Junius gave him a mere hint from which Mr. Woodfall made out his identity. Mr. Woodfall is said to have been a scrupulously honorable man, and would never have betrayed the confidence which Junius may have reposed in him.

The reader may be curious to know how and where Junius procured such quick and accurate information on all that transpired in connection with the Government. At that time, there were two distinct parties in England: The Royalist Party and the Whig Party. The latter was headed by Lord Chatham, who was, perhaps the ablest statesman in the kingdom. Lords Temple, Rockingham and Camden, and John Calcraft, a member of the House of Commons, with many other lesser lights, also belonged to the Whig

Party, all of whom were in positions, in the Ministry or Parliament, which enabled them to be perfectly and quickly informed as to what was going on in every department of the Government. Mr. Woodfall, the proprietor of the "Public Advertiser," was the publisher of current events of the day, which appertained to the welfare of the Whig Party, and Junius was its mouthpiece. Junius was always on the alert to find out all that transpired with the King, the Ministry and Parliament, and Mr. Woodfall was eager to accumulate all the news he could, much of which he received from those leaders of the Whig Party, which in turn he secretly and clandestinely imparted to Junius, to be by him, put in proper shape for publication in the "Public Advertiser." Mr. Calcraft was a prolific source, from whom much of this information proceeded. He was a warm friend of Lord Holland, who belonged to the Ministry, and stood close to the King, which enabled him to keep well posted on what transpired in that quarter, which no doubt, he conveyed to Mr. Calcraft, and this may account for Junius being a little partial to Lord Holland.

Inasmuch as I have copied and cited many of his letters, of the highest merit for scholarship as well as statesmanship, it may not be amiss in me to give to the reader my impressions and opinion of the characteristics of Junius and his very remarkable Letters, which have excited so much interest in the literary world.

I wish all my readers were as familiar with these as I am, in order that they might more fully appreciate their merits, for the good which they have accomplished over the civilized world, and especially in America, which I will more fully explain in the succeeding part of this book. I think I can say without the fear of successful contradiction, that the Letters of Junius are the greatest literary productions of which we have any knowledge, and I believe that the ablest of critics fully coincide with me in this opinion.

The remarkable ease and fluency with which his letters are written; the choice selection of his words, and the facility with which he arranged them in his sentences; the concise

statement of his facts, and the admirable harmony of the whole: all clearly demonstrate his complete mastery of the English language. His style is epigrammatic, very polished, and easily comprehended. His periods are well rounded and complete. His sentences are mostly of uniform length, giving them a certain harmony and rhythm, which is very pleasing to the ear. His facts are concisely grouped together, and carry conviction to the mind of the reader. His arguments are logical and overwhelming in their force against his adversary. His antitheses, which are frequent, are highly demonstrative of the ideas which he undertakes to convey. His comparisons are lucid, and seldom fail to accomplish his aim. His syllogisms are perfectly formed, and usually carry conviction with them. His sarcasm and criticisms are caustic in the extreme, and his victim keenly feels their lacerating effect. His irony, in which his Letters abound, is bitter and severe. His ridicule is overpowering to his adversary. His metaphors are brilliant, one of which I will here insert: "Private credit is wealth, public honor is security. The feather which adorns the royal bird, supports its flight. Strip him of his plumage, and you fix him to the earth." This is an elegant and true expression.

His interrogations, in which he delights, are very pointed and generally bring the person interrogated to his knees. His innuendoes always force a blush to the cheek of his victim. Altogether, when he makes a charge or an assertion, he has the facts to sustain him. His writings all indicate that he was a man of fine education; thoroughly acquainted with ancient and modern history, and perfectly familiar with the ancient classics. He was a fearless, aggressive and courageous writer, always ready to defend his ideas and doctrines to the last extremity.

He was evidently born and reared as one of the *people*, was in thorough sympathy with them, and had no affiliation whatever with the aristocracy. He was a pronounced republican in his ideas about Government, and despised a monarchy in all of its departments. There is absolutely no

levity in his writings; he is always dignified, reserved and rather sedate.

While on this branch of my subject, I will state what others thought of this wonderful literary prodigy and his remarkable Letters.

Dr. John Mason Good, a very clever and elaborate critic, has written a very exhaustive commentary on the subject, of about ninety pages, which shows great research and mental labor, which he calls the "*Preliminary Essay on Junius and His Writings.*" It will be found in the front part of Vol. I of Bohn's Standard Library, entitled "Woodfall's Junius," and is well worth the reading of any one; portions of which I will copy for the edification and entertainment of my readers:

Dr. John Mason Good, in his "Preliminary Essay on Junius and His Writings," says:

"It was not from personal vanity, but a fair estimate of his own merit, and the importance of the subject on which he wrote, that the author of the ensuing letters predicted their immortality. Their matter and their manner, the times they describe, and the talents they disclose, the popularity which attended them at their outset, the impression they produced on the public mind, and the triumph of most of the doctrines they inculcate, all equally concur in stamping for them a passport to the most distant posterity."

. . . . . .

"A series of unsuccessful ministries, often profligate and corrupt, and not infrequently cunning, rather than capable; a succession of weak and obsequious parliaments, and an arbitrary, though able Chief Justice, addicted to the impolitic measures of the Cabinet, fatally concurred to confound the relative powers of the State, and equally to unhinge the happiness of the Crown and of the people; to frustrate all the proud and boasted triumphs of a glorious war, concluded but a few years before by an inglorious peace; to excite universal contempt abroad, and universal discord at home.

Hence France, humiliated as she was by her losses and defeats, did not hesitate to invade Corsica in open defiance of the remonstrances of the British Minister, and succeeded in obtaining possession of it; whilst Spain dishonourably refused to make good the ransom she had agreed to, for the restoration of the capital of the Phillipine Isles, which had been exempted from pillage upon this express stipulation. They saw the weakness and distraction of the English Cabinet, and had no reason to dread the chastisement of a new war.

"The discontents in the American Colonies, which a little address might at first have stifled, were blown into a flame of open rebellion, through the impolitic violence of the very Minister who was appointed, by the creation of a new office at this very time, and for this express purpose, to examine into the causes of dissatisfaction, and to redress the grievances complained of; while, at home, the whole of the ways and means of the Ministry, instead of being directed against the arrogance of the common enemy, were exhausted against an individual" [John Wilkes].

. . . . . .

"It was at this period, and under these circumstances, that the Junius Letters successively made their appearance in the "Public Advertiser," the most current newspaper of the day. The classic purity of their language, the exquisite force and perspicuity of their argument, the keen severity of their reproach, the extensive information they evince, their fearless and decisive tone, and, above all, their stern and steady attachment to the purest principles of the constitution, acquired for them, with an almost electric speed, a popularity which no series of letters have since possessed, nor, perhaps, ever will; and what is of far greater consequence, diffused among the body of the people a clearer knowledge of their constitutional rights than they had ever before attained, and animated them with a more determined spirit to maintain them inviolate. Enveloped in the cloud of a fictitious name, the writer of these philippics, unseen himself, beheld with secret satisfaction the vast influence of

his labours, and enjoyed, though, as we shall afterwards observe, not always without apprehension, the universal hunt that was made to detect him in his disguise. He beheld the people extolling him, the Court execrating him, the Ministers and more than ministers trembling beneath the lash of his invisible hand."

. . . . . .

"While the editor of the present impression does not undertake, and, in fact, has it not in his power to communicate the real name of Junius, he *pledges* himself to prove, from incontrovertible evidence, afforded by the private letters of Junius himself during the period in question, in connection with other documents, *that not one of these pretenders has ever had the smallest right to the distinction which some of them have ardently coveted.*"

I think that Dr. Good has fulfilled the above pledge. The Doctor further says: "That he was not only a man of highly cultivated general talents and education, but who had critically and successfully studied the language, the law, the constitution and history of his *native* country, is indubitable. Yet this is not all; the proofs are just as clear that he was also a man of independent fortune, that he had moved in the immediate circle of the Court, and was intimately acquainted, from its first conception, with almost every public measure, every ministerial intrigue, every domestic incident.

"That he was a man of easy, if not affluent circumstances, is unquestionable from the fact that he never could be induced in any way or shape to receive any acknowledgment from the proprietor of the "Public Advertiser," for the great benefit and popularity he conferred on this paper by his writings, and to which he was fairly entitled. When the first genuine edition of his letters was on the point of publication, Mr. Woodfall again urged him either to accept half its profits, or to point out some public charity or other institution to which an equal sum might be presented. His reply to this request is contained in a paragraph of one of his

Private Letters, No. 59, and confers credit on both the parties: 'What you say about the profits is very handsome. I like to deal with such men. As for myself, be assured that *I am far above all pecuniary views*, and no other person I think has any claim to share with you. Make the best of it therefore, and let all your views in life be directed to a solid, however moderate independence; without it no man can be happy, nor even honest.' "

Of Junius's style Dr. Good has this to say: "The distinguishing features of his style are ardour, spirit, perspicuity, classical correctness, sententious, epigrammatic compression, his characteristic ornaments, keen, indignant invective, audacious interrogation, shrewd, severe, antithetic retort, proud, presumptuous disdain of the powers of his adversary, pointed and appropriate allusions, that can never be mistaken. Similes, introduced, not for the purpose of decoration, but of illustration and energy; brilliant, burning, admirably selected and irresistible in their application."

. . . . . .

"To pursue this critique further would be to disparage the judgment of the reader. Upon the whole, these letters, whether considered as classical and correct compositions, or as addresses of popular and impressive eloquence, are well entitled to the distinction they have acquired; and quoted, as they have been, with admiration in the senate, by such nice judges and accomplished scholars as Mr. Burke and Lord Eldon, eulogized by Dr. Johnson, and admitted by the author of the 'Pursuits of Literature' to the same rank among English classics as Livy or Tacitus among Roman, there can be no doubt that they will live commensurately with the language in which they are composed."

. . . . . .

"From the observations contained in this esssay, it should seem to follow unquestionably that the author of the Letters of Junius was an ***Englishman*** of highly cultivated

education, deeply versed in the language, the laws, the constitution and history of his native country; that he was a man of easy, if not affluent circumstances, of unsullied honour and generosity."

The editor of "Junius by Woodfall" says: "Dr. Good, in the above elaborate dissertation, appears to have *fairly cleared the stage of all pretenders to Junius's honours*, up to the period of his editorship in 1812. Sixteen years later he seems to have considered the mystery as *inscrutable as ever*, though he admits that at the time he wrote, the claims of Sir Philip Francis had not been publicly advanced. But, with a full knowledge of Mr. Taylor's book '*Junius Identified with a Distinguished Living Character*,' he still continued *skeptical*; and in a letter to Mr. Barker, concludes despairingly, with the expression, 'That the great political enigma of the eighteenth century was likely to lie beyond the fathoming of any line and plummet that will be applied to it in our days.' We insert the entire letter from the late Mr. Barker's pleasant volume of literary *melange* on the Junius question:

" 'Guilford Street,
October 13th, 1826

" 'Dear Sir:

" 'Accept my thanks for your obliging copy of your first letter on the subject of Junius and Sir Philip Francis. Many years ago, as you perhaps may be aware, I *entered at full into this research, and beat the bush in every direction.* At that time, however, the claims of Sir Philip Francis had not been advanced, at least not before the public. But they had been brought forward; *the arguments by which it is obvious they may be met*, and many of which you have yourself ably handled, would, I think, have *succeeded in putting him as completely out of the list as all the other competitors appear to be put, whose friends have undertaken to bring them forward.* The question is, nevertheless, one of great interest, as well on the score of national history, as of literary curiosity. Yet, like many other *desiderata*, I am afraid it is likely to lie beyond the fathoming of any line and plummet that will be applied to it in our days. I shall be happy to hear of your success, and am, dear sir, faithfully yours,

J. M. GOOD.' "

" 'To E. H. Barker, Esq.

The foregoing *plainly* shows that Dr. Good did not think that Sir Philip Francis was the author of the Junius Letters.

Mr. John Wade, another critic on the subject, thoroughly investigated the claims made by the friends of these "would-be Juniuses," and he likewise put them all out of the contest. He says: "Junius has been a favourite theme of literary exercise, and there is not one of the above thirty-five names on which a book, pamphlet, review, essay or disquisition has not been written, but almost the whole number are inadmissible under the general class-rules previously established. I apprehend the field will be cleared of pretenders, up to the publication of Woodfall's Junius in 1812."

Junius appears to have been very much discouraged, as appears from his letter No. LVIII, Vol. I, pp. 408-409 of Bohn's Edition of Junius by Woodfall, a part of which I will copy. But he continues, most strenuously, to reconcile the desertions, especially in the Whig Party, with which he was fighting:

LETTER LVIII

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER

"No man laments more than I do, the unhappy differences which have arisen among the friends of the people, and divided them from each other. The cause undoubtedly suffers as well by the diminution of that strength which union carries with it, as by the separate loss of personal reputation, which every man sustains when his character and conduct are frequently held forth in odious or contemptible colours. These differences are only advantageous to the common enemy of the country: the hearty friends of the cause are provoked and disgusted; the lukewarm advocate avails himself of any pretense to relapse into that indolent indifference about everything that ought to interest an Englishman, so unjustly dignified with the title of moderation; the false, invidious partisan, who creates or foments the disorder, sees the fruits of his dishonest industry ripen beyond his hopes, and rejoices in the promise of a banquet, only delicious to such an appetite as his

own. It is time for those who really mean the *cause* and the *people*, who have no view to private advantage, and who have virtue enough to prefer the general good of the community to the gratification of personal animosities,—it is time for such men to interpose. Let us try whether these fatal dissensions may not *yet be reconciled*; or, if that be impracticable, let us guard at least against the worst effects of division, and endeavor to persuade these furious partisans, if they will not consent to draw together, to be separately useful to that cause which they all pretend to be attached to. Honour and honesty must not be renounced, although a thousand modes of right and wrong were to occupy the degrees of morality between Zeno and Epicurus. I speak to the *people* as one of the *people*. Let us employ these men in whatever departments their various abilities are best suited to, and as much to the advantage of the common cause as their different inclinations will permit. They cannot serve *us* without essentially serving themselves.

"Would to God it were practicable to reconcile these important objects in every possible situation of public affairs. I regard the legal liberty of the meanest man in Britain as much as my own, and would defend it with the same zeal. I know we must stand or fall together. In the shipwreck of the State, trifles float and are preserved, while everything solid and valuable sinks to the bottom, and is lost forever.

JUNIUS."

After the lapse of some time, he wrote the following:

PRIVATE LETTER No. 63

January 19, 1773

To H. S. Woodfall:

"I have seen the signals thrown out for your old friend and correspondent. Be assured that I have good reason for not complying with them. In the present state of things, if I were to write again, I must be as silly as any of the horned cattle that run mad through the city, or as any of your wise aldermen. *I meant the cause and the public.* Both are given up. I feel for the honour of this country, when I see that there are not ten men in it who will unite and stand together upon any one question. But it is all alike, vile and contemptible.

"*You* have never flinched that I know of; and I shall always rejoice to hear of your prosperity.

"If you have anything to communicate (of moment to yourself) you may use the last address, and give a hint."

The last political letter of Junius was addressed to Lord Camden, on the 21st day of January, 1772, in which he urged him, as a member of the House of Lords, to make an attack on Chief Justice Mansfield on the question of his having illegally bailed John Eyre, who had stolen a large quantity of paper from the Government at Guildhall, was "caught with the goods" and should not have been bailed, but should have been committed to prison to await his trial.

Junius intimated in his letter that Eyre was a Scotchman, and therefore Lord Mansfield showed favor to him by illegally bailing him. Mansfield was a Scotchman, which was abhorrent to Junius. Notwithstanding, Junius made a very strong personal appeal to Lord Camden to make the attack on the Lord Chief Justice, and had furnished him with a copy of a very elaborate letter which he had recently written on the subject, in which he went into all the facts of the case, including the law, and in which he had made a very bitter attack on Lord Mansfield; still Lord Camden declined his request, although articles of impeachment against Lord Mansfield were then pending in Parliament, for his open and flagrant violation of the law of libel, as it then stood.

I will copy portions of the LXIX letter of Junius to the *Right Honourable Lord Camden*, and will call the attention of the reader to the beautiful metaphor in the beginning of the letter:

"January 21st, 1772

"My Lord:

I turn with pleasure from that barren waste, in which no salutary plant takes root, no verdure quickens, to a character fertile, as I willingly believe in every great and good qualification. I call upon you, in the name of the English nation, to stand forth in defense of the laws of your country, and to exert, in the cause

of truth and justice, those great abilities with which you were intrusted for the benefit of mankind. The legal argument is submitted to your Lordship's judgment. After the noble stand you made against Lord Mansfield upon the question of libel, we *did* expect that you would not have suffered that matter to have remained undetermined.

"If there be a judge or lawyer of any note in Westminster Hall who shall be daring enough to affirm, that according to the true intendment of the laws of England, a felon, taken with the *manner, in flagrante delicto*, is bailable, or that the discretion of an English Judge is merely arbitrary, and not governed by rules of law, I should be glad to be acquainted with him. Whoever he be, I will take care that he shall not give you much trouble. Your Lordship's character assures me that you will assume that principal part which belongs to you, in supporting the laws of England against a wicked Judge, who makes it the occupation of his life to misinterpret and pervert them.

"When the contest turns upon the interpretation of the laws, you cannot without a formal surrender of all your reputation, yield the post of honour even to Lord Chatham. Considering the situation and abilities of Lord Mansfield, I do not scruple to affirm, with the most solemn appeal to God for my sincerity, that, in *my* judgment, he is the very worst and most dangerous man in the kingdom. Thus far, I have done my duty in endeavouring to bring him to punishment. But mine is an inferior ministerial office in the temple of justice. I have bound the victim, and dragged him to the altar.

JUNIUS."

This seems to have discouraged Junius, and he was very much disheartened, on account of many other changes in the political sentiments which had transpired among his coadjutors in "the cause," which were much to his surprise and mortification. In his private letter to Mr. Woodfall, No. 59, dated March 6th, 1772, he says: "If I saw any prospect of uniting the City of London once more, I would readily continue to labor in the vineyard. Whenever Mr. Wilkes can tell me that such an union is in prospect, he shall hear from me."

Afterwards, on January the 29th, 1773, in the very last letter which Junius wrote to Mr. Woodfall, he advances precisely the same motives for his continuing to desist from writing any more. (See page 29, Vol. I.)

Owing to his recent discouragements, and the untoward circumstances which then surrounded him, Junius quit writing his political letters. It could truly have been said of him, "Othello's occupation is gone," at least for the time being. He then employed himself in revising and correcting his political letters which he presented as a gift to Mr. Woodfall for publication. This, and his private business, kept him employed for some time. But, as he before said in a letter to Mr. Woodfall, "*Quod si quis Existimat me aut Voluntate Esse Mutata, aut Debilitata Virtute, aut Animo Fracto, Vehementer Errat*"—which being translated, is as follows: "If anyone believes me to be changed in will, weakened in integrity, or broken in courage, he errs greatly." No! his ponderous intellect and powerful pen were not destined to remain inactive. Neither were his spirits broken. Another field soon opened to the talents of this extraordinary genius.

JUNIUS NOW LEAVES LONDON AND COMES TO AMERICA IN THE PERSON OF THOMAS PAINE

During the succeeding year, in the Autumn of 1774, the unknown Junius was introduced to the celebrated American diplomat, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, by the distinguished English statesman, Lord Chatham, whom history says was a coadjutor of Junius in "the cause," and it is asserted that probably he had a suspicion of his identity. The Doctor represented the Colonies, at the Court of St. James, in London. No doubt he soon discovered that his new acquaintance was a man of talent, and also that he was a warm friend of the oppressed American Colonies; and probably Lord Chatham hinted that he was Junius.

Therefore, he advised him to go to America, and gave him letters of introduction to some of his most prominent

friends there. He thereupon took the advice of Dr. Franklin and soon left for Philadelphia; on his arrival there, he quickly got employment on the "Pennsylvania Magazine," and rapidly began making a reputation as a writer. He wrote many articles on the most important issues of the day, particularly on the political disturbances between England and America.

All the while he was busy making himself acquainted with the condition of the Colonies, their resources, and the sentiments of the people towards Great Britain. This *Americanized Junius* also began to study what course they should pursue to prevent further encroachments by England on their rights. In the meantime, he was busy preparing to write his first pamphlet, over a fictitious signature, as he had been doing in the Junius Letters, which he completed and published on the 21st day of January, 1775, of which 4000 copies were printed by him and distributed among all the Colonies. Almost every one procured a copy, and read it with profound interest, as they were anxious to know what remedy he proposed to ameliorate their condition. At first, they were struck with awe as they perceived that it would soon lead to open rebellion against Great Britain, which would be treason, the consequences of which they contemplated with horror. They felt that the Colonies were not prepared to make such an issue, and they had not given up all hope of making a compromise with England, although their petitions looking to this end had been spurned by the King and the Ministry.

I will ask the reader if it would not have been very remarkable that such a powerful writer as Junius should have dropped his pen entirely, after having produced those wonderful letters, which had gained the admiration of the world, and never to have written anything else to be handed down to posterity? Furthermore, I will ask him if he believes that Junius retired to a life of insignificance? I, for one, do not, for a moment, entertain such an idea of this remarkable genius. I hope to convince my readers that the writings of this literary prodigy did not end with his Junius Letters, in London, but, that soon after he quit writing there, he again

took up his versatile pen, and wrote other letters and pamphlets, under an assumed name, along the identical lines of his first letters, in which he advocated the same doctrines, in another country, severely criticising the same King, Ministry and Parliament, as he did over the signature of Junius; but under other and different circumstances. His subsequent writings electrified the whole civilized world, shook the throne of England to its foundation, as well as other monarchies, and won for him an imperishable glory for his great assistance in giving birth to a new and a powerful nation.

But I find I am about to invade Part III of my subject before discussing Part II, therefore, I will here quit Part I by dropping the mysterious Junius for the present; but I will take him up again, under his real name, in Part III, of this volume, where I hope to prove his certain identity to the satisfaction of my readers.

PART II.—FRANCIS

HAVING now finished the discussion of Part I of my subject, I shall proceed to discuss Part II. As I have before stated, about thirty-eight different persons have been brought forward by their respective friends as claimants of the distinguished honor of being the author of the "Junius Letters," and have all been put out of the contest by several eminent literary critics, in one way and another, by satisfactory modes of proof and sound reasoning. After the subject had lain dormant for about forty years, Mr. John Taylor, a new writer, all at once conceived that he had discovered a new author for those remarkable letters, in the person of the Rev. Philip Francis, an Episcopal clergyman, who was then chaplain to Lord Holland, and was the father of Sir Philip Francis.

After having written quite a long essay on the subject, he says: "But before I went to press, I requested a friend to call on Sir Philip Francis and consult him about it." Mr. Taylor discovered his error. Sir Philip then had an interview with Mr. Taylor and told him "That he was surprised at the 'wild goose chase' which he was pursuing, in which he was wasting his time" in writing his pamphlets claiming the Rev. Philip Francis as author of the Junius Letters; he further stated to him: "That so many years had elapsed and so many fruitless attempts had been made to discover Junius, that it now seemed perfectly hopeless to expect he would ever be found out." "For he would be a lucky person indeed," continued Sir Philip, "who could find out Junius." "Why, it would make a man's fortune," he further added. Finding that these discouragements had failed to make the desired impression, he observed in parting with Mr. Taylor: "If you do persist in your purpose, I hope you will present

me with a copy of your book." See page 87, Vol. II, of Junius by Woodfall, Bohn's Standard Library, and also page 88. Mr. Taylor very cunningly omitted the foregoing from his book, because he knew it would be a "clincher" against him. Consequently he "switched" the subject around and fixed the authorship of the Letters on Sir Philip Francis. Mr. Taylor likewise requested his friend to ask him (Francis) if he had any objection to his publishing his "new departure" on the subject; to which Francis replied: "You are quite at liberty to print whatever you think proper, provided nothing scandalous be said respecting my private character." *Vide* p. 7.

This evasion of the question by Sir Philip seemed to have created the impression on the mind of Mr. Taylor that Francis admitted he was the author of the Letters. I think this was a very strained conclusion on the part of Mr. Taylor. However, he proceeded to enlarge his pamphlet to a book of four hundred pages. He eliminated the name of Doctor Francis and substituted in its place, the name of Sir Philip Francis and changed the title from "A Discovery of the Author of The Letters," to "The Identity of Junius with a Distinguished Living Character, Established," which Mr. Taylor applied to his new book; and, in the meantime, revised it, as above stated, and got it in readiness to go to the press for publication. Before proceeding any further, Mr. Taylor informs us that the editor of the "Monthly Magazine," wishing to write an editorial on the book, addressed a letter to Sir Philip Francis on the subject, in a way least likely to render the inquiry offensive; and in reply received the following epistle, which I insert at length, in justice to Sir Philip Francis and Mr. Taylor: "THE GREAT CIVILITY OF YOUR LETTER INDUCES ME TO ANSWER IT, WHICH, IF I WOULD REFER MERELY TO ITS SUBJECT MATTER, I SHOULD HAVE DECLINED. WHETHER YOU WILL ASSIST IN GIVING CURRENCY TO A SILLY MALIGNANT FALSEHOOD, IS A QUESTION FOR YOUR OWN DISCRETION. TO ME IT IS A MATTER OF PERFECT INDIFFERENCE. "I AM YOURS AND SO FORTH,

P. FRANCIS."

To the editor of the "Monthly Magazine," July, 1813.

I cannot imagine how Mr. Taylor could have had the hardihood to proceed with the publication of his book, after receiving this sharp rebuke from Sir Philip Francis. On page 9 of Mr. Taylor's book he says: "The editor thought either *yes* or *no* would be the frank reply, and in his own opinion he received the *latter*." I do not see how any one could possibly construe the answer otherwise than a plain and a very positive negative, which meant that he was *not* the author.

It appears to me rather strange that Mr. Taylor did not insert in the last edition of his book all the editor of the "Monthly Magazine" had to say about the answer of Sir Philip Francis. It is likely that the editorial put an end to the claim made by Mr. Taylor, that Francis was Junius, and that is why he left it out. I should be glad to know exactly what the editor said on the subject. I cannot see why the plain, unequivocal and emphatic answer of Sir Francis to the editor did not put this question forever at rest, so far as it concerned Sir Philip.

Mr. E. H. Barker, a most excellent critic, on page 177 *of his book entitled, "The Claims of Sir Philip Francis to the Authorship of Junius's Letters, Disproved," says: "Sir Philip Francis wrote to Sir Richard Phillips, the editor of the 'Monthly Magazine,' stating that it was a 'silly malignant falsehood,' to attribute the authorship of the Letters to him." Mr. Barker says: "What language could be stronger, or more to the point?"*

He further says: "Upon the receipt of this communication, Sir Richard Phillips, the editor, immediately abandoned any further enquiry, perceiving the theory was built on an erroneous supposition." Nevertheless, Mr. Taylor persisted in the publication of his book, after writing several pages of very weak arguments, trying in every way which ingenuity could devise or sophistry could invent, to prove just the opposite of the very plain language of the answer of Mr. Francis. He evidently felt the very stinging rebuke in the letter—that he was guilty of a "*silly, malignant falsehood.*" He seemed to be trying to convince his readers that Mr. Francis was *joking*, in his letter to the editor. See pages 12-16 of Taylor's book.

All this occurred more than forty years after the Junius Letters were written and after all other claims of the honor had been swept away, except his claim in behalf of Francis, which he had signally failed to establish.

It will be observed that the editor of the "Monthly Magazine" put the question of the authorship of the Letters clearly and fairly up to Mr. Francis, for him to affirm or deny, and he denied it. Francis knew that his answer would appear in all the public prints of the day. He further realized that if he falsely claimed the authorship of the Letters, the real author might be living, and would probably come out and publicly denounce him as a falsifier and prove it on him, which Junius very likely would have done; this would have stamped him with infamy among all his friends. But Sir Philip Francis was not that kind of a man. He was born and bred a gentleman, and would not have been guilty of such a dastardly act. The reply made by him was a very severe reflection on Mr. Taylor, as it accused him directly of being the author of a "*silly, malignant falsehood.*"

Dr. Samuel Parr, quite an eminent author, says that Francis was not Junius, and gives many reasons why, in a letter to Mr. E. H. Barker, on pages 242 and 243 in Mr. Barker's book, already referred to by me, to which I would call the reader's attention. On page 447 of his book, Mr. Barker says: "The first letter which appeared under the signature of Junius brought the writer to instant and full celebrity." He further says: "Junius is immeasurably superior to Francis in *style*, but his superiority in *mind* is still greater." Mr. Barker's book abounds in numerous facts and arguments going to show that Francis was not Junius.

There are numerous historical facts which go to prove that Francis was not Junius, some of which I have already mentioned, and others will follow in their proper order. In some instances, I have taken extracts from history; in others, I refer to the books and pages only, for the reader to consult if he wishes; as it would extend this volume beyond its capacity to copy even one fourth of them.

Francis wrote a short essay on Government in the latter part of his life, which he called "Regency," *vide* p. 216 of Taylor's book entitled "The Identity of Junius with a Distinguished Living Character," in which Francis is made to *copy* many of the ideas and expressions of Junius, by Mr. Taylor, pp. 219, 220 and 222.

I wish to call special attention of my readers to what his biographers, Parkes and Merivale say in the "Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis," as to his writings. In their "Preliminary Remarks" to the Memoirs, on page 7, Vol. I, they have this to say: "His acknowledged writings, though numerous, are of inferior interest, reprints of speeches, and pamphlets on subjects of temporary importance. His life was, on the whole a failure." On page 9 they further write: "*Now it is important to observe, and the more so in order to disabuse the public of possible anticipations, that the Francis papers, voluminous as they are, contain no word of confession on his part as to the authorship of Junius. Nor do they contain, so far as we have been able to discover, any direct evidence of it whatever.*" On page 19 Ib. these biographers further remark: "The late Mr. Thomas Wentworth Dilke, in a series of able articles in the 'Athenaeum,' and 'Notes and Queries,' has critically exposed the insufficiency of evidence of all the false claims; still considering that, for Sir Philip Francis, 'Unproven' and improbable." These biographers are very partial to Mr. Francis, but they are very truthful throughout the two very large volumes of "The Memoirs."

This book by Mr. Taylor was finished in 1816, forty-three years after the Junius Letters were written. He says on page 223: "To produce a few side facts from Junius, from which the preceding examples are maintained, in nearly the same words by Francis, will contribute more to certify his identity, as Sir Philip Francis, than any remarks which might be made upon them." He then cites numerous quotations from the "Regency," and from Junius, to prove their similarity. I agree they are similar, and in many instances are identical, as they were *copied*, almost literally,

by Francis from Junius. They are pure plagiarisms, but do not in any way go to prove that Francis was Junius. On page 33, Mr. Taylor says, that many of the quotations from the "Regency" were "nearly coeval with the letters of Junius," when in fact they were written by Francis, thirty-seven years after the last letter of Junius, and after the mind of Francis had grown to maturity. I am sorry to say that Mr. Taylor does not always confine himself strictly to the truth in his arguments to sustain his contention. Others have said the same thing about him.

Mr. Fraser Rae, an eminent writer on the subject, says on page 32 of the "Athenaeum" of Jan. 8th, 1898: "As Taylor's book is founded upon the *false* assumption of Francis's *expulsion* from the War Office [*he resigned*], the book is entirely untrustworthy from title to colophon."

Mr. Taylor narrates that Francis was *expelled* from the War Office, but Francis says that he voluntarily *resigned*. Mr. Taylor has a purpose in this. If he could have established the fact that Francis was *expelled* by Lord Barrington, then Secretary of War, it would show a reason for Junius's being so bitter in his denunciation of Lord Barrington, which Taylor attempts to show in his assertion that Francis was Junius. In many other instances, Mr. Taylor strains the facts, in every way, to carry his point.

On page 398 Mr. Taylor says that the King, Lord North and Lord Grenville were made acquainted with the real name of Junius in 1772. He contends that they gave Francis the appointment as Commissioner to India, at a salary of 10,000 pounds per annum, as a *bribe* to keep him from writing any more letters against them, under the name of Junius. *Vide* pp. 399 and 400; and that he was recommended by Lord Barrington for the position. Now if Lord Barrington knew that Francis was Junius, he must have been of a very forgiving nature to have given this vicious writer the recommendation, who had so bitterly denounced him under the name of Junius. This is all a surmise on the part of Mr. Taylor, to carry his point, even though it reflected so cruelly on the character of Mr. Francis. He was born and

bred a gentleman, and no one has cast the least reflection on his character, except Mr. Taylor and the degenerate grandson of Sir Philip Francis, H. R. Francis, who wrote a book in 1894 called "Junius Revealed," and therein maintained that his grandfather, Sir Philip Francis, had taken and received the commission to India, as *a secret bribe* by the English Government.

I am fully aware that it is incumbent upon me to entirely eliminate Mr. Francis from the contest before I introduce the person whom I claim to be the undoubted author of the Letters; therefore, although my readers may conclude that I am elaborating the proof to the above end, I feel that I must make good my assertion that Francis did not and could not have written the Letters; and also, I must answer the arguments of Mr. Taylor and H. R. Francis.

One of the principal arguments of Henry R. Francis in his "Junius Revealed," in favor of the theory that his grandfather was the author of the Letters, was, that Sir Philip was *bribed* to quit writing as Junius, by being appointed as one of the Commissioners to India. On page 53 he says: "In which approved principle, then, of building the bridge of gold, after surprising the enemy, they [the King and Ministers] would seek at once to effectually silence the hostile mouth-piece, and to conciliate Junius's most influential well wishers." He further says: "My belief is that its two-fold object was attained by Francis's last letter from the War Office, and was accomplished by a promise, probably from Lord North, Prime Minister, of a good appointment abroad, after the shortest interval that might suffice to avert the immediate *suspicion* of a *bargain*; Francis on his part engaging to drop the role of masked pamphleteer, but never to remove the mask he had worn as Junius, but all the parties had the gravest reasons for keeping it *dark*." The foregoing is the belief of this degenerate grandson, who besmirched the fair name of his dead grandfather to get a little imaginary glory for himself and others of the descendants of Sir Philip Francis. "O shame, where is thy blush!"

The other arguments which he uses are very similar to those used by Mr. Taylor—bare assertions and surmises, wholly unsupported by any facts. Sir Philip Francis said: "I always suspected Burke of being the author of The Letters." *Vide* p. 40 of "Junius Revealed." Mr. Woodfall, the publisher of the Junius Letters, said: "To my certain knowledge, Francis is not Junius." See p. 25, Vol. I of "The Francis Letters." In a letter dated March 10th, 1770, which was written by Alexander Macrabie, from Philadelphia, to Francis, who was his brother-in-law, he said: "Junius is the Mars of malcontents." . . . . "His letter to the King is past all endurance as well as all *compare*. Who the devil can he be?" He further says: "I have read all that correspondence [between Sir William Draper and Junius] and never before met with such keen cutting satire." *Vide* p. 112, Vol. I, "The Francis Letters." In a letter dated London, June 12, 1770, Sir Philip Francis replies as follows to Macrabie's letter: "Junius is not known, which is as curious perhaps, as any of his writings. I have always suspected *Burke*, but whoever he is, it is impossible he can ever discover himself. The offense he has given to his Majesty and the Duke of Grafton, is more than any private man can support, he would soon be crushed." *Vide* p. 243, Vol. I of "Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis." Can anything be stronger to show that Francis was not Junius?

On page 68 of his book, Mr. Taylor asserts, that Francis and Lord Barrington had a "falling out between them" and that Lord Barrington *expelled* him from the War Office, and that D 'Oyle was *expelled* from the same office.

In January 1772, Mr. Francis writes to his cousin, Major Baggs as follows: "You will have heard that Mr. D'Oyle has *resigned* his employment. He did it while I was at Bath. Immediately upon my return, my Lord Barrington was so good as to make me an offer [of D 'Oyle's place, as Deputy Secretary of War], with many obliging and friendly expressions. I had solid reasons for declining the offer." *Vide* p. 133, Vol. I of the "Francis Letters." On March 20th, 1772, Francis wrote Major Baggs another letter, as

follows: "At the end of this quarter, I leave the War Office. It is my own act. Be not alarmed for me, everything is secure and as it should be." p. 134. Francis says, on June 4, 1772, "While he and his brother-in-law, Macrabie, who had then returned from America, were walking in the park, they met a gentleman who informed them that John Chollwell, one of the intended Commissioners to India, had declined the nomination. It was the King's birthday and Lord Barrington had gone to court. I saw him next morning; as soon as I had expressed my views to him, he wrote the handsomest, strongest letter imaginable in my favor to Lord North, for the position. Other interests contributed, but I owe my success to Lord Barrington." *Vide* p. 148, Vol. I of the "Francis Letters."

From these letters it does not look like Francis was *expelled* from the War Office and that there was any "falling out" between Francis and Lord Barrington, as stated by Mr. Taylor, and, on which he founds his main arguments in his book. See page 6. This is another instance where Mr. Taylor has perverted the truth.

In connection with this branch of my subject, I will make a few other references to Junius, which go to prove that Francis was not Junius. They all refer to the very severe strictures of Junius on the intimate friends of Mr. Francis. The above is in relation to the "Veteran Letter," *vide* p. 405, Vol. II of Bohn's Standard Library Woodfall's Junius, which letter is generally conceded to have been written by *Junius*, but Mr. Taylor states it was written by Sir Philip Francis as Junius. I think I can convince my readers that he is utterly mistaken. This letter is very abusive of Francis's friend and benefactor, Lord Barrington, and was written to the printer of the "Public Advertiser," on the 23rd day of March, 1772, by Junius commencing as follows: "I desire that you will inform the public that the worthy Lord Barrington, not contented with having driven Mr. D'Oyle out of the War Office, has at last contrived to *expel* Mr. Francis. I think the public have a right to call on Mr. D'Oyle and Mr. Francis to declare their reasons for quitting

the War Office. Men of their unblemished characters do not resign lucrative employments without some sufficient reason. When the public loses the services of two able and honest servants, it is but reasonable that the wretch who drives such men out of public office, be compelled to give some account of himself and his proceedings."

(Signed) "Veteran."

Mr. Taylor says that he based his discovery of Junius on the "Veteran Letter." His idea being, that inasmuch as the letter was very hostile toward Lord Barrington, that Francis must have written it. I ask my readers if it is not preposterous to think that Mr. Francis wrote the "Veteran" Letter? In the first place, Mr. Taylor says that D'Oyle and Francis were *expelled* and driven out of the War Office. Mr. *Francis* said they both voluntarily *resigned*, in order to get better positions, in which they succeeded.

It will be observed that the writer of the "Veteran" Letter uses the personal pronoun "I," in the first person, all the way through the letter, which reads as follows: "*I* desire that you will inform the public," etc., etc.

Now if Francis was the author of this letter, he was calling on *himself* to declare the reason for quitting the War Office, and inordinately praising himself as a man of "unblemished character" and also "an able and honest servant of the government," which appear in the latter parts of the letter, and make it inconsistent with the idea that Francis wrote it. If Mr. Francis, as Junius, wrote the letter, as claimed by Mr. Taylor, was it not very inelegant in him to bestow such fulsome praise on *himself*?

The fact is, as soon as Junius heard that D'Oyle and Francis had quit the War Office, he immediately informed the "Public Advertiser" that they had been expelled. Perhaps he was not acquainted with the facts, and probably his version of it, that they were expelled, suited his purpose best, in order to bring odium and criticism on Lord Barrington,

because he was Secretary of War in the Grafton Ministry, which he (Junius) was trying in every way to break up, as before stated.

It is well known that Lord Barrington was a wily Scotchman, and was, by no means, an exemplary member of the King's Ministry. He moved the expulsion of the celebrated John Wilkes from Parliament, which was seconded by one Rigby, and carried; and one Luttrell was put in his place, whom Wilkes had defeated by a very large majority in the Middlesex election. These and many other reasons conspired to make Junius despise him; and write those malignant letters against him.

In his "Private Letters" to Mr. Woodfall, No. LX, page 59, Vol. II of Bohn's Standard Library, Junius says: "Next to the Duke of Grafton, I verily believe that the *blackest heart* of the Kingdom belongs to Lord Barrington."

In his letter No. LII to Mr. H. S. Woodfall, he says: "Having nothing better to do, I propose to entertain myself and the public with torturing that * * * (damned) Barrington." A few days later in Letter CVII, he writes as follows to Lord Barrington: "When the bloody Barrington, that silken, fawning courtier at St. James—that stern and insolent Minister at the War Office, is pointed out to universal contempt and detestation, you smile indeed, but the last agonies of the hysteric passions are painted on your countenance; your cheek betrays what passes within you, and your whole form is in convulsions. The very name of Barrington implies everything that is mean, cruel, false and contemptible."

Is it reasonable to suppose that Francis, as Junius, should have so maligned the character of his best friend, who had treated him so very kindly for many years? I cannot believe that he could have been so lost to every emotion of gratitude, and every instinct of an honorable man.

Furthermore, if Francis were Junius, he would not have so abused some of his other friends, to-wit: John Calcraft, who remembered him in his will, and left him 1000 pounds, and his wife an annuity of 250 pounds during her lifetime.

This was before he received the commission to India, and while he was a poor man. Mr. Wilbor Ellis, who was formerly Secretary of War, gave him his *first* position in the War Office, as shown by his letters. David Garrick, the famous comedian, and Sir William Draper, both of whom were intimate friends of Mr. Francis and his father, were also victims of Junius.

If Francis were Junius, he also abused Lord North, Prime Minister, who gave him his appointment as Commissioner to India. On page 36 of Woodfall's Junius, in Bohn's Standard Library, Vol. II, among other things, he says: "My Lord, I never address your Lordship, but I feel the utmost horror and indignation, for I consider you as a man totally regardless of your honour and the welfare of your country. Every principle of conscience, you have, long ago, been hardy enough to discard. There has not been an action in the last two years of your life, but what, separately, deserves imprisonment. The time may come, and remember, my Lord, there is a very short period between a Minister's imprisonment and his grave." See also Letter XLVIII, page 246, Vol. II wherein Junius handles Lord North, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, pretty roughly.

Mr. E. H. Barker, a most astute critic and profound reasoner, in his book of 500 pages, which is devoted almost entirely to proving that Sir Philip was *not* Junius, and in which he has succeeded, says on pages 31 and 32: "Sir Philip is, in his public character, allowed by all impartial men to have been a man of the most unblemished moral integrity and of the purest political principles. Now to suppose him to have been the author of Junius, is, in fact, to proclaim him a villain of a vulgar cast; for he must be henceforth regarded by us as a base ingrate to his great benefactor, patron and friend, the Earl of Chatham, without any assigned or assignable cause. It is to proclaim Sir Philip a hypocrite of the blackest dye, professing in his Parliamentary speeches and avowed productions to have ever felt the strongest attachment to the person, and the highest veneration for the character of Lord Chatham, when he had

in truth, commenced his literary and political career by a series of virulent and anonymous libels on him. It is to proclaim Sir Philip to have been an idiot of the grossest stupidity, for it would make him, though a mere clerk in the War Office, risk his official situation and even personal existence, by calumniating the Ministry, whose servant he was, and without any apparent motive of private pique. It is to proclaim Sir Philip to have acted on principles contrary to the ordinary principles of human nature; for men do not desert and libel their benefactor, patron and friend, nor do they act in direct opposition to their own private interests, without some powerful motive, which has not been shown in the case of Sir Philip Francis, at the date of the *earliest* known production of Junius, viz: April 28th, 1767."

On page 171 of Mr. E. H. Barker's very researchful book, he further says: "After the patronage which Sir Philip Francis had in early life experienced from Lord Chatham and Lord Mendip, and after the severity with which they have been treated by Junius, any attempt to identify Sir Philip and Junius, *if successful*, would be only to procure for Sir Philip literary reputation by the total sacrifice of public and private character;—*To proverbialize his name, memorialise his crimes*, and *eternise his infamy*."

"Other arguments on this branch of the question will occupy a second letter," said Mr. Barker.

What motive could Francis have had for traducing his best friends and benefactors? I cannot think of any. Every human action is prompted by a *motive*; but *Junius* did have a positive motive for abusing every one of the above named individuals, because they were all connected with the English Government, which he was attempting to destroy; except Garrick, and Junius conceived that he was trying to discover his identity, which aroused his anger.

Had the King, Lord North and Grenville known that Francis was really Junius, they never would have compromised by giving him the commission to India, but would have had him arrested, cast into prison, tried and punished to the full

extent of the law. Could they, as honest Government officials, have done otherwise, after the English Government had spent thousands of pounds for the arrest of the wicked Junius? On page 401, Mr. Taylor tries to conciliate Mr. Francis, after asserting that Francis was the author of the Letters. He says: "Sir Philip Francis must be content to share the lot of all those who have *causam celebritatis*." Taylor further remarks: "It is said that Mr. Francis is angry at the charge—that would be folly." Mr. Taylor must have had the lowest standard of morals and truth, for as I have already stated, Sir Philip Francis did all he could to discourage Mr. Taylor in writing his book, and for the very best reasons and motives. *Vide* pp. 7 and 9. In the first place, he was a truthful man. He did not wish to claim the distinguished honor of writing the Letters, when he knew he was not the author. He was perfectly aware that if the King and the Ministry ever were convinced that he was Junius, they would have arrested him and proceeded against him criminally.

Besides, he well knew that if they even suspected him of being Junius, he could never hope to get a promotion from that source. The fact is, that his life-long friend, Lord Barrington, Secretary of War, whom Francis had served so long, cordially recommended him to Lord North for the appointment as one of the Commissioners to India, because he had full capacity, by his long experience in the War Office; therefore, Lord North gave him the appointment and it was confirmed by the King. He was not appointed until June, 1773, under the Act then recently passed by Parliament, which is more than a year and four months *after* Junius wrote his last political letter; but Mr. Taylor says that the appointment was made in June, 1772, which was more than a year *previous* to the passage of the Act authorizing the appointment of the Commissioners to India; but he wanted it to appear that Junius was *still* writing his cruel letters against the King, the Ministry and Parliament, when in fact, he had quit writing a year and four months

earlier. This is another perversion of the truth which Taylor made, in order to sustain his point. *Vide* p. 399.

The reason of Mr. Taylor's persistence in writing his book, notwithstanding Mr. Francis endeavored to dissuade him from it, was this: He had spent about three years getting up his data and writing the book. It would have been more mortification to him to have been forced, a second time, to acknowledge to the public that he had made *two* distinct mistakes in selecting the author for the Junius Letters.

In addition to the foregoing, he would have lost all the emoluments which he received from the sale of his book, which amounted to a large sum.

Likewise, he knew that he would enjoy considerable celebrity as a writer, in having made the discovery of the mysterious author of The Letters. All these conditions naturally conspired to impel him forward in the publication of his book. Furthermore, Junius was a native-born Englishman, as appears through all of his letters, and Francis was an Irishman, born in Dublin. On page 176 of his book, Mr. Barker says: "It is proved by incontrovertible evidence that Junius was an Englishman." Francis's father was a clergyman of the Established Church of England. The family removed from Dublin to London when Sir Philip was ten years old. Soon after their arrival, Dr. Francis was appointed chaplain to Lord Holland, chief paymaster in the King's army; and thereafter, the associates of young Francis were aristocrats, among whom he was reared, and naturally became imbued with their ideas and their political affinities.

As his father was a poor man, Sir Philip was given a "small clerkship" in the Secretary of State's office when about fifteen years old, to help make a living for the family, and later on received the appointment to a clerkship in the War Office by Lord Barrington, which position he held about ten years, and he must have been brought up in the principles of royalty. These appointments took him from school and limited his education.

He was married at the age of twenty-one to a Miss Elizabeth Macrabie, two or three years his senior, whose

father was in reduced circumstances. It appears the father of each of them was opposed to the alliance, on account of their financial conditions, but the young couple did not heed their parental advice, and were married. In a few years, he was the father of five daughters and one son, and his wife a confirmed invalid. He had to contribute to the support of his invalid father, and also to his wife's father and mother, which kept him continually in financial straits.

I have taken these facts from the history of his life, which show that he could not have been able to attend to the duties of his office, and to have taken so much of his time in getting up the information for the finished composition of the Junius Letters; to have carried on his voluminous correspondence with Mr. Woodfall, Mr. Wilkes, Sir William Draper and many others, and at the same time, though very poor, refusing to accept a dollar for any of his laborious writings, as was the custom of Junius. On the contrary, Junius was evidently in easy financial circumstances, as stated in his letters, and positively refused to accept any compensation for any of his writings from his publisher, Mr. Woodfall. Besides, he contributed liberally towards the expenses of defending a very malignant prosecution which the Government instituted against Mr. Woodfall for the publication of some of the Junius Letters. It is a well-known fact that Francis did not have the mental ability and the education to write The Junius Letters, at the early age of about twenty-seven years, when they were first commenced, under the name of "Lucius." Mr. Barker, on page 121 says: "Now, then, I ask Mr. Taylor whether he supposes that an inferior clerk in the War Office, which Mr. T. himself confesses to have required from its officers 'constant attendance,' could, at the age of twenty-seven (when the earliest production of Junius appeared), have found leisure, first to learn the profession of authorship, secondly to practice it, thirdly to commence the practice with writing, for a regular series of years, papers perfect in their style of composition? The fact is not at all credible; so opposed to common sense and common experience, that, if it had actually

To Mr David Garrick

I am very exactly informed of your impertinent inquiries, & of the information you so basely sent to Richmond, & with what triumph & exultation it was received. I knew every particular of it the next day. Now mark me, Vagabond — keep to your functions, or be assured you shall hear of it. Meddle no more, thou busy informer! — It is in my power to make you curse the hours, in which you dared to interfere with Junius

---

I doubt much whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you, but if things take this turn I expect. You shall know me by my Works. J.

occurred, it must be regarded as miraculous, and the testimony even of an ocular witness could not easily work its way to our belief."

If the reader will take the pains, which I have taken, to compare any of the Junius Letters with anything which Francis wrote about the same time, I think he will coincide with me in my opinion that there is no similarity whatever between them in style.

The letters written by Francis are generally light and frivolous without much force or beauty, as will be seen in Vol. I of the Francis Letters, edited by Beta Francis, his granddaughter, and Eliza Karey, in which many words are misspelled, and numerous capital letters are placed where they do not belong. This is to be expected of one who had such a limited education.

On the contrary, all the letters written by Junius are grave, dignified, logical, very forceful, beautifully and fluently expressed; his words are all correctly spelled; his capitals are in their proper places: all of which shows that they are the work of a scholar and a great genius. Several literary critics and friends of Mr. Francis say that if he did not write the Junius Letters, then he left nothing of a literary character to posterity. See Vol. I, page 6 of the "Memoirs of Francis."

I will now take up the question of human nature, which I think is very pertinent in this investigation. Human nature is now, and always has been, the same all over the world, and among all people. Gratitude is a living principle in every heart, unless a person is a moral pervert, which rarely happens. It is found in the breast of the savage, and even among our domestic animals. If a nice morsel is given to our dog, he looks up into the face of the giver, with a kind expression, which indicates his gratitude. Therefore, whenever a gratuitous act of kindness is extended from one person to another, the recipient always feels an instinctive emotion of gratitude in his heart.

Shakespeare, the great expositor of human nature, puts into the mouth of the venerable King Lear the following

words: "Ingratitude, thou marble hearted fiend, how sharper than a serpent's tooth to have a thankless child."

I have already said that Sir Philip Francis was born of excellent parentage, and was reared among gentlemen and as a gentleman. He was a man of culture and refinement, and would not have stooped to a dastardly act of ingratitude. No one has ever said less of him. Therefore, can we even suspect that he was lacking in the noble attribute of unselfish gratitude to his generous benefactors? As I have stated above, I can not believe it. It is unreasonable. It is contrary to all the laws of human nature.

If Francis were Junius, as contended for by Mr. Taylor, he was a moral pervert indeed. He did not have a spark of gratitude in his nature, which I will proceed to demonstrate by other facts recorded in history.

Now if Francis *were* Junius, he returns the basest ingratitude to others of his friends, for the many kindnesses which they had shown him. See p. 288, Vol. I, in Letter 38, Woodfall's Junius, where Junius, in commenting on some motion made by Mr. Ellis before Parliament, says: "The little dignity of Mr. Ellis has been committed. The mine was sunk; combustibles were provided, and Welbore Ellis, the Guy Faux of the fable, waited only for the signal of command. All of a sudden the country gentlemen [members of Parliament] discover how grossly they have been deceived; the Minister's heart fails him, the grand plot is defeated in a moment, and poor Mr. Ellis and his motion taken into custody. . . . . Whether he makes or suppresses a motion, he is equally sure of disgrace." Junius commenting on another motion to impeach the Mayor and Sheriff of London, says: "Little manikin Ellis, told the King that if the business were left to *his* management, he would engage to do wonders, and it was thought odd, that a motion of so much importance should be intrusted to the most contemptible little piece of machinery in the whole kingdom," etc. Mr. Ellis gave Francis a clerkship in the office of Secretary of State, when he was a boy.

T

Vol. IX. 1790 N. H. S. Woodfalls

Printers in

Mr. C. F. Karey, in speaking of the argument used by the anti-Francis critics said, that Francis, if Junius, was very ungrateful to some of his best friends and benefactors. He says in Vol. I, page 22 of the Francis Letters: "This is an argument of considerable weight; of the fact of this discrepancy, there can be no doubt. It was especially towards Lord Barrington and towards Calcraft, both personal friends and benefactors of Francis; and in a degree hardly less towards Sir William Draper, that Francis, if Francis was Junius, showed himself strangely *false*, if not vindictive." This is a strong admission by Mr. Karey, who was a warm friend and advocate of Francis.

The affairs in India were in a very bad condition; Lord Clive had been governor there for a long time, and had robbed and oppressed those people outrageously. He had recently been recalled, so that the Government was arranging to create a commission of five members to govern that unfortunate country; Mr. Francis was perfectly aware of it, and was looking to a position on the commission, as appears from what he says in one of his letters above referred to.

Shortly thereafter, Parliament did enact a law creating the Commission, and, as above stated, his friend and former benefactor, Lord Barrington, recommended him to Lord North for one of the Commissioners, with Warren Hastings as Governor General; John Clavery, George Monson, and Richard Barswell, were the other Commissioners, to which Francis was added as the fourth, by Lord North. Nevertheless, Mr. Taylor would have us believe that Francis, as Junius, was all the while a secret enemy of, and vile traitor to, Lord Barrington and Lord North, while he was writing those very severe letters, under the name of "Junius," against these benefactors, as shown in the "Veteran" letter, and others of the Junius Letters, herein above referred to.

I hope I will not weary my readers by stating some remarks, which Francis, as Junius, made about Mr. Calcraft, as insisted upon by Mr. Taylor. In letter LIX of Woodfall's Junius, Vol. I, page 416, he says: "Even the silent vote of Mr. Calcraft is worth reckoning in a division. What

though he riots in the plunder of the army, and has only determined to be a patriot when he can not be a peer. Let us profit by the assistance of such men while they are with us, and place them, if it is possible, in the post of danger, to prevent desertion." Mr. Calcraft had been an army agent, and had become rich.

Next, I will take up David Garrick, the great actor, who was a warm personal friend of the family, to whom Doctor Francis dedicated the play of "Eugenia," which was composed by the Doctor for the stage. Now, if Francis were Junius, he wrote a very unnatural letter to Garrick. *Vide* Letter XLI, in the Private Letters of Junius to Woodfall, Vol. II, page 41, Woodfall's Junius, a fac-simile of which I will insert in this book.

I beg pardon of my readers for imposing on their patience by so greatly elaborating this branch of my subject.

It seems that Garrick was trying to find out who Junius was. As I have already copied some of his letters against Sir William Draper, the reader is informed of what he said against him. When we look over the bitter letters which Francis, if Junius, wrote against the friends of his father, and his own friends, and benefactors, what must be our natural and rational conclusion if we should accept the theory of Mr. Taylor, that Francis was the real author of the Junius Letters?

I will leave the reader to make up his own opinion on the subject, as I have already expressed mine. Mr. Taylor in his arguments that Francis was Junius, has stamped his memory with the blackest type of infamy, by accusing him of taking a bribe, as Commissioner to India.

If the reader has the opportunity, and will examine Mr. Taylor's ponderous volume of four hundred pages, entitled "Junius Identified," he will perceive that he has devoted over one hundred pages to comparisons of the styles of Francis and Junius, with a view of showing some similarity between them, nearly all of which he has selected from the speeches of Francis made in the House of Commons, forty years after the Junius letters were written, and after his

the opposite Course, and has succeeded accordingly.

* * * I will know how heavily the public Burthens press, in every Sense and Direction," * * *

mind was much more [illegible] copied the identical idea [illegible] in many instances, and [illegible] which are downright [illegible] ingenious and plausible [illegible] book shows that he [illegible] jecture and rumor [illegible] his fertile imagination [illegible] that Francis was the [illegible] he made a dismal failure. [illegible] "*Parturiunt montes nascetur ridiculus mus*."

Inasmuch as Mr. [illegible] gest the name of Sir Philip Francis [illegible] Junius Letters, after the [illegible] forty years, he has had a [illegible] his footsteps, in many [illegible] the most conspicuous [illegible] arguments I have recently read [illegible] than his opinions on Mr. Taylor's [illegible] ticle of original proof [illegible] say that he has investigated [illegible] ular thought [illegible] suggestions which he was [illegible] ment is very brief and [illegible] injustice. Therefore [illegible] that Mr. Taylor has made [illegible] ate effort to prove that Francis [illegible] I have done. Then Mr. [illegible] it and must fall [illegible] any other discussion [illegible] Mr. Taylor's [illegible]

Furthermore the [illegible] page 200, Vol. I, by the [illegible] fall family has been that Francis was [illegible] page 203, they refer to [illegible] son Woodfall communicated [illegible] the following anecdote [illegible] sions of Francis, [illegible] my father returning [illegible]

9
t
c
1

mind was much more mature; in which Francis actually copied the identical ideas of Junius, in words a little different in many instances, and in others he uses his very words, which are downright plagiarisms. Mr. Taylor is a very ingenious and plausible writer, and is very resourceful. His book shows that he appropriates every idea, surmise, conjecture and rumor which he could find, devise or invent in his fertile imagination, in order to prove, as far as possible, that Francis was the author of the Junius Letters, in which he made a dismal failure. It may be truly said of his efforts: "*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*"

Inasmuch as Mr. John Taylor was the first one to suggest the name of Sir Philip Francis as the author of the Junius Letters, after the subject had lain dormant for over forty years, he has had a few followers who have trodden in his footsteps, in making up their opinions on the question; the most conspicuous of whom is Lord Macaulay, whose arguments I have carefully read and found them nothing more than his opinions on Mr. Taylor's book, and without a particle of original proof to sustain them. He does not even say that he has investigated the subject, or given any particular thought to it, but bases his assertions entirely on the suggestions which he took from Mr. Taylor's book. His comment is very brief, and, in my opinion, does Junius great injustice. Therefore, if I have successfully demonstrated that Mr. Taylor has made a complete failure in his elaborate effort to prove that Francis was Junius, which I think I have done, then Macaulay's opinion has nothing to sustain it and must fall to the ground; and I may say the same of any other obsequious follower of Mr. Taylor, in his book.

Furthermore, the editors of "Memoirs of Francis," on page 299, Vol. I, say that "The current belief in the Woodfall family has been that Francis was *not* Junius at all," and on page 293, they further say: "The eldest son of Henry Sampson Woodfall communicates to Mr. Parks [one of the editors] the following anecdote, among others, hostile to the pretensions of Francis, more than forty years since: 'I recollect my father returning from the Pauline dinner, saying to some

friends, that he had met his old school fellow, Francis, then soon after his return from India, in 1781. A gentleman present, observed to my father (H. S. W.) "Then you have seen your old friend Junius?" on which he replied, with very marked emphasis: "To my certain knowledge, Francis never wrote a single line of Junius.' "

This seems very strong evidence to me, as coming from the elder Woodfall. The editors of the Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis, in my opinion, are perfectly honest and fair in writing the book, but Mr. Taylor and H. R. Francis do all in their power to discredit them, whenever they encounter anything which does not accord with their side of the controversy.

Mr. Leslie Stephens, an eminent critic, in "The Annual Biography," Vol. IV, page 231, says: "Sir Philip Francis ridiculed the idea of his being the author of the letters signed Junius; he said: 'I have already written on that subject until I am tired. I will write no more letters, answer no more questions relative to it. If mankind are so obstinate as not to believe what I have already said, I am not fool enough to humble myself any more—I have done.' "

From all I have been able to discover on the subject, Junius had no wife or family, or anyone else dependent upon him, as he never mentioned either, in any of his letters, which he most likely would have done in his Private Letters to Mr. Woodfall. Therefore he was able to devote all his time to study, accumulating facts, visiting Parliament to hear what was going on there, and talking with eminent persons in the Whig Party, who could post him upon the current political events of the day, and in this wise equipping himself for writing his mysterious letters. On the other hand Francis was married at twenty-one years of age, and in a few years was the father of six children, five girls and one boy, with an invalid wife, which must have been a great care and expense to him, and naturally absorbed much of his thought and time in looking after, and providing for their wants. Besides, he was a poor man, and dependent upon what he called a "meager salary." He frequently

I shall learn from Your Brother what

P. Francis.

I beg of you to make whatever Use of my Privilege You think fit, without the smallest Scruple. —

complained of his constant work as clerk in the War Office. Therefore he could have had no time to collect the necessary facts and information of different kinds, which he was compelled to have in order to prepare those very finished political letters of Junius, besides carrying on his voluminous correspondence with Mr. Woodfall, and writing numerous other letters, which he necessarily had to do, in reply to those written by others about him. Besides, Francis received no compensation for his letters, if he were Junius, which was the well-known custom of the real author of The Letters. The latter could afford it, because he was, at least in easy circumstances, as shown by his writings. Furthermore, it appears to me that Francis could have done but little studying, reading, or writing at home, especially at night, when his family was around him. We all know that the silent hours at night are the best for composing and writing on any subject which requires time and thought. We may reasonably presume that Junius wrote some of his best letters at night, when all was quiet around him.

In one of his letters to Mr. Alex. Macrabie, his brother-in-law, Vol. I, page 96 of the Francis Letters, he says: "Domestic news is as insipid as usual. Children bawling, servants fighting, my wife scolding, your mother and father weeping, and Betty raving mad. This is the perpetual history of my family." His wife's mother and father lived with him most of the time, and "Betty" was his wife's cousin, who also lived with them.

It seems that he was in a deplorable condition! In another letter to Macrabie, page 105, on the subject of politics, he says: "We have politics enough, God knows, but as I have not the honour to be entrusted with the secrets of either party, I can give you nothing but what you will see much more elegantly set forth in the newspapers. Truth is out of the question. Each party says and believes just what suits themselves, without decency or moderation, and a neutral party is detested by both. A philosopher has no more chance among them than a cat in hell."

The foregoing letter and post-script are perfect fac-similes of the handwriting of Junius, copied from one in the front part of Vol. I of "Junius by Woodfall," of Bohn's Standard Library, and vouched for by the author. The reader will perceive that the post-script is signed "C," which is a recognized signature of Junius, supposed to stand for "Candour." In the post-script he says: "I doubt whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you." This proves conclusively that Francis did not write the letter or the post-script, because it is well-known, as I have before said, that David Garrick, the great comedian, was an intimate friend of Dr. Philip Francis, the father of Sir Philip. The Doctor dedicated his play "Eugenia" to Garrick. Is it reasonable that Sir Philip Francis should have written such a severe letter to his father's friend? I cannot believe it.

The two foregoing letters of Sir Philip Francis, and an extract from a letter of Junius, are fac-similes of the same letters inserted by Mr. John Taylor in his book entitled: "The Identity of Junius with a Distinguished Living Character Established," and are therefore vouched for by Mr. Taylor, as correct copies of the originals. He reproduced them in his book to prove the similarity between them, in the handwriting, style, etc., of Francis and Junius. I insert fac-similes of them in my book to prove the entire *dissimilarity* between them. I can see no similarity whatever between them in handwriting, style or otherwise. The reader can judge for himself. Observe the difference in the *double s's* of the Francis and Junius letters and the numerous capitals in the wrong places in the Francis Letters.

It appears that Francis was neutral in politics, and was trusted by neither party. His letters bordered on silliness, and were written by a man of ordinary ability. Remember that they were written about the time Junius was writing his letters, as one of them was a comment upon one of the Junius Letters.

In order to do ample justice to my subject, I feel that I must refute all the theories assumed by Mr. Taylor, H. R.

Francis and their followers, in their attempts to prove that Sir Philip Francis was the author of the Junius Letters, although in so doing, I may weary my readers. However, I will be as brief as possible. As Mr. Taylor and H. R. Francis dwell particularly on the similarity of the handwritings of Junius and Sir Philip Francis, I will here adduce further and other proofs to show that their handwritings were not similar, but, on the contrary, were totally dissimilar.

Sir Harry Nicholas, a ripe scholar and eminent critic, in his "Analysis of Junius and his Works," says, on the subject of handwritings: "It is as impossible for a person to disguise his handwriting, in an effectual manner, as to change his features, or his voice, unless he be a professed mimic, or ventriloquist."

Let me ask the reader to *try* to disguise his handwriting for only an hour, and he will, I believe, find out that it is almost impossible to give uniformity to the size and angles of his letters, and make the same pressure on his pen in shading his letters all alike. He will soon discover what a strain on his mind it will prove, and on the muscles of his hand, always to be on the alert in order that he may not fall back to his natural handwriting. If this be so for one hour's writing, what would it have been to Junius in carrying on his very large correspondence of four or five years with Mr. Woodfall, besides all his other writings? It was simply impossible for him to have disguised his handwriting all that time. *If the reader will examine the copies of the writings of these two persons, which I have inserted herein,* I believe he will soon be convinced that there is not the least similiarity between them; that of Francis, who had been a clerk in the War Office for about twelve years, is a bold, round, clerical hand, of the ordinary size generally in use on public records; while that of Junius was a very small hand, with the letters very closely written, and very angular in shape, with many more letters to the line, besides, they are perpendicular; nor is there any shading on them, which is shown in Francis's writing. The reason for his writing such a small and close hand, no doubt, was, that he could

write so much more rapidly, and could get so much more on a page, which was a great saving of his time and his paper. I do not know how it is with others, who have a great deal of writing to do, but I find that I have fallen into the same habit of writing a very small and a very close hand, although my natural hand is rather large and not closely written. A relative said to me a few days ago, that she never saw any one who could put so much on a page.

Those *theorists* who advocate the Francis side of the question, and especially Mr. Taylor, who first "*discovered*" Francis, about forty years after the Letters were written, were then driven to some other alternative to get around this obstacle, which confronted them, and therefore asserted the novel theory that all of Junius's Letters were written in a disguised hand, without giving any reason why he should have done so. He was wholly unknown, therefore how could any one possibly know what kind of a hand he wrote? Then why should he have put himself to all the extra trouble and inconvenience of disguising his hand, during a period of four or five years, even if it were possible for him to have done so? Mr. Fraser Rae, an eminent writer on the subject, says: "Mr. George Woodfall, and a writing master of note, by the name of Tomkins, in the City of London, asserted that Junius's handwriting was not feigned." See "Athenaenum."

After Mr. Taylor realized that his theories, first as to the similarity of the handwritings of Junius and Francis, and second, that Junius disguised his handwriting, could not be sustained, he conceived the idea that Junius had all his letters copied by some one. This is the weakest invention of them all. In the first place, the question arises, Why should he have had his letters copied? No one knew who he was, therefore, it mattered not whether his letters were copied, or in his own handwriting. A little reflection will convince anyone that Junius had a very strong reason for *not* having them copied, as it would have led, almost certainly, to his detection. Could he possibly have found a person whom he could trust with the secret? It would have been an easy thing for the copyist to have gotten quite a

little fortune from the Government, by disclosing the name of Junius, and Junius would have never known of the treachery of the confidante. The King and all his minions were on the alert to discover this mysterious writer, and spared no expense in trying to find him; and had they succeeded, it would have cost him his liberty, and possibly his life. Then why should he have taken such a risk for nothing? The idea is preposterous. In a letter to Mr. Woodfall, herein before referred to, he says: "I should not survive a discovery three days, or, if I did, they would attaint me by bill."

The Francis Letters were compiled by Beta Francis, a granddaughter of Sir Philip Francis, and Eliza Karey, in two large volumes, both of which I have carefully read, in order to see if Francis had left any writings to show that he was the author of the Letters; but I discovered nothing whatever which even intimated that he had any connection with them. They are singularly free from anything touching the subject. The editors of the Francis Letters induced a Mr. C. F. Karey, possibly the husband of Eliza Karey, to write an essay on the subject of the authorship of the Junius Letters, which they inserted in front of the first volume, to which I invite the attention of the reader. On pages 22, 24, 25 and 26, he tries to prove by assertions and arguments merely, with no facts, that Francis was Junius. I have carefully read the whole essay of thirty-two pages. He did not seem at all familiar with the political ideas of Francis, his associations, handwriting, etc. I have no doubt that he did his utmost on behalf of Francis, but, in my opinion, "he failed to make out his case," as lawyers would say.

It is beyond the scope of this volume to include many letters of Francis, which go to show that he always sided with the Royalists in every contention with the American Colonies; I will refer my readers to some of them, *vide* Vol. I, pp. 72, 75, 96, 103, 106, 112, up to p. 148, but I will quote from one letter to his friend Mr. Allen, on the subject of taxing the Colonies, in any and every manner the English Government thought proper; in which doctrine, Francis

coincided with them. It is well known that Junius, even in his first political letter, took exactly the opposite ground, and was always the staunch friend of the Americans.

Francis, in writing to his friend Allen in regard to a question which he says ever agitated the English Parliament, says that they had a right to tax the American Colonies in any way they chose. In Vol. I of Francis's Letters, page 72, he says: "Since Mr. Pitt thought fit to declare himself so strongly in favour of the *Claims* of the *Americans*: It is true that his opinion and manner of declaring it, were universally condemned by every Englishman above the rank of a Blacksmith. . . . . Yesterday the point was solemnly argued by both Houses. . . . . The Debate lay between the two great pillars of the law, Lords Chief Justice Camden and Mansfield. . . . . The Debate took its rise from a motion made by the Duke of Grafton as follows: 'That the King's Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled, had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient tone and validity to bind the Colonies and people of America subjects to the Crown of Great Britain, in all cases whatsoever.' . . . . Lord Camden opposed the motion. . . . . When Lord Mansfield had made his reply, it was so full, so learned, so logical, and in every respect so true, that not an atom of doubt remained in the breasts of his hearers."

Furthermore, I will call attention to the bad spelling of Francis, *vide* Vol. I, pp. 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 of "The Francis Letters." His spelling was very inaccurate, to-wit: "Ally" for alley, "Stile" for style, "Compleat" for complete, "Risque" for risk, "Encrease" for increase, "Untill" for until, "pacquet" for packet, and most words ending in "l," he used "ll," as "wrongfull," shamefull," etc., besides numerous others. He used a great many capital letters in the middle of his sentences, *vide* the same references as above, and pages 56 to 66. This goes to show that he was not well educated. The fact is, that he did not have the opportunity,

as he was taken from school when about fifteen years old, to assist his father in supporting the family.

On the contrary, Junius spelled very correctly, and his capitals were all in their proper places, which show that he was a man of good education. H. R. Francis relies on another theory to prove that Sir Philip Francis was Junius. It appears that a cousin of Sir Philip, by the name of Tilghman, was very much in love with a Miss Giles, and requested Sir Philip to assist in his suit. He wrote and dedicated some *very poor* verses of poetry to the young lady, which were copied by Tilghman, and sent to her in his own name, which can be seen on page 82 of "Junius Revealed," by H. R. Francis. On the envelope in which he sent them, were written words in a different handwriting, which is unexplained and which H. R. Francis insists were in the handwriting of Junius.

I will refer the reader to pages 83 and 84 in "Junius Revealed" for a comparison of the handwriting, if he has the opportunity of doing so, as I have carefully done. I believe he will coincide with me in the opinion that it is a very poor counterfeit of the handwriting of Junius. This affair, in my opinion, was "trumped up" by the author of "Junius Revealed," as no reference to the Giles episode is made in Mr. Taylor's book, nor is it even referred to in the "Memoirs of Francis." The authors of both those books would have commented upon it, if they could have, in any way, conceived that there was the least merit in it. In fact, H. R. Francis bitterly complains that the editors of the "Memoirs of Francis" did not insert in their work a written statement which he furnished them about the poetry sent to Miss Giles, of which they took no notice. See page 9 of "Junius Revealed."

Another argument used by Mr. Taylor on his subject, was that Junius said in one of his letters: "I wish Lord Holland may acquit himself with honour." In order that the reader may comprehend the above quotation, I will explain it. Lord Holland was the Right Honorable Henry Fox, and was Paymaster General of the King's Army. He appears to

have been delinquent in his accounts with the Government, in a large sum, and was being pressed for a settlement. This is what Junius refers to above. Lord Holland was the father of the celebrated orator and statesman, Charles James Fox, who was somewhat in unison with Junius in his political views; and no doubt, he wanted to make a friend of him, in his contest against the Grafton Ministry, in preference to making him his enemy by criticising his father, Lord Holland, who was then in trouble with the Government. Besides, at that time it had not been proven that he was a defaulter to the Government, as he insisted that the reason why he was behind in his settlement, was that he had been unable to get returns from his sub-paymasters, many of whom were a great distance from London. Junius may have felt that it would hardly be fair to openly criticise him under the circumstances. Besides, when Junius made a charge, he always had the facts to sustain him. But, Mr. Taylor says that the reason why Junius said: ""I wish Lord Holland may acquit himself with honour," was that Francis, whom he now conceives to be Junius, had received a "little clerkship" when a boy, in the office of Secretary of State, through the influence of Lord Holland; and that he and Dr. Francis were friends. It strikes me that this obligation of gratitude to Lord Holland, after the lapse of so many years, amounted to very little, when we come to consider how very ungrateful he was to all his father's friends, and to his own benefactors; that is, if Francis were Junius, as contended for by Mr. Taylor.

Let us now consider who would most probably have known something of the secret, if Francis had been the author of the Letters. His father would certainly have had some inkling of it. The editor of "Junius by Woodfall" in Vol. II, p. 59 says: "That he states it on the *best authority*, that Dr. Francis, the father of Sir Philip, was entirely unconnected with the writings of Junius, and he was as much in the dark respecting the author, as any reader of the 'Public Advertiser.'" He further says: "This information has been kindly communicated to me by the grandson of Sir

Philip Francis, upon the authority of a letter of Dr. Francis in his possession." Dr. Francis was a very literary man, and a fine writer, and could have been of great assistance to Sir Philip in writing the Letters, had he been the author. Park and Merivale, who were the editors of the "Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis," on pages 11 and 12 say: "Late in life, at seventy-five, Sir Philip married a second wife, an old maid, who survived him many years. She was an old acquaintance of his, and was inspired with the utmost affection and admiration for him. She was also [he says, It is with pain the editor indulges in so ungallant an avowal respecting the impression she left on him] one of the most garrulous, credulous, inaccurate and in every way perplexing of reminiscents." And yet Macaulay seemed to rely implicitly on what she said about Sir Philip and his literary works, and especially about the Junius Letters. In her letter to Lord Campbell, after Francis's death, she said: "He was very anxious to avoid either assent or denial [that he was Junius], lest he might implicate truth or honour, both of which he was very jealous of committing." Of course he was; as I have said before, he was an honest man, and would not have told an untruth about it, for the honor of being regarded as the author of the Letters. Besides, if he had laid a false claim to the authorship, he would naturally have feared detection.

There is no doubt in my opinion, from her letter to Lord Campbell, that Francis equivocated to her about it. He was a very vain man, and would have enjoyed the reputation of being the author, very much. No doubt when she "tackled" him on the subject, and accused him of being the author, he did not deny "The soft impeachment." Had he really been the author of the Letters, is it not natural that he should have imparted the secret to his wife and his father, under a solemn injunction of secrecy? If he could not trust them, whom could he trust with the secret? Besides, this was about fifty years after the Junius Letters were written, when all public excitement about them had subsided, and there was no danger whatever of a prosecution being entered

against the author, by the Government. Therefore, as I have before said, his biographers, Messrs. Park and Merivale, say: "If Francis was really the author, why did he not come out publicly, and claim the distinguished honour?" It would have rendered his name immortal! History informs us that he was a very vain man, and I do not believe that he could have died contented without revealing the secret. No one would have been prouder of this great distinction than Sir Philip Francis, had he been the real author. Besides, he could have realized quite a fortune, by publishing The Letters over his own name. There was but one reason why he did not make the announcement, and that was, he knew that he could not truthfully and conscientiously claim the authorship. As I have already said, he was an highly honorable man, and would not have claimed an honor to which he was not entitled. Besides, he knew that even if he had the temerity to make the claim, the real author would probably have exposed his identity, in asserting a false claim to the honor, which would have been the ruin of Mr. Francis. But "Truth is mighty and will prevail." The unquestionable fact is: Francis was *not* the author. Messrs. Park and Merivale, editors of the "Memoirs of Francis" were his friends, but they were strictly truthful all the way through the work of two large volumes, which I have carefully read. In Volume I, page 6, they say: "His acknowledged writings, though numerous, are of inferior interest, being reprints of speeches, and pamphlets on subjects of temporary importance." On page 9, Vol. I, they say: "It is important to observe that the Francis papers, voluminous as they are, contain no word of confession, on his part, as to the authorship of Junius, nor do they contain, so far as we have been able to discover, any direct evidence of it whatever."

I will make a sketch of the private life of Sir Philip Francis, in order to contrast it with that of Junius. As I have already said, Junius was very grave, sedate and even austere in all of his writings. He never indulges in any levity whatever. No jokes or anecdotes were ever employed by

him. He is dignified throughout his works, and confines himself mostly to facts and solid arguments, interspersed with other attributes which are highly distinctive of his character. Frivolity and levity appear all the way through "The Francis Letters"; some instances of which, I already have, and others, I will reproduce herein; but by no means all of them, as they are too numerous for the size of this volume. I have said before, he had a wife and six children. She was almost a confirmed invalid, and spent much of her time at Bath, a seaside resort, for the recuperation of her health, leaving the children with him, as is shown in some of his letters. Her health was somewhat improved before he went as one of the Commissioners to India. He left her and the children in London, and was absent from them several years. This gave him an opportunity to indulge in some of his wild propensities, of which he seems to have availed himself. He soon got in the habit of imbibing too freely, and became quite a gambler, as betrayed by his letters. See Vol. I, pp. 223, 224, 225 of the "Memoirs of Francis."

PHILIP FRANCIS TO HIS WIFE

(Page 158)

"My dearest Betty:

I snatch one moment, being all that I can spare from feasting, singing, gaming, riding, and sleeping in a bed as wide as our best parlour, to tell you that I perform all the offices of life above mentioned to admiration.

"Lady Clive has it much at heart that her guests sleep well, and the beds are incomparable. This, you know, is a capital circumstance. I am just risen from a monstrous dinner with twenty-three of Lord Clive's free-voters at Bishop's Castle. Lady Clive drinks your health every day, not forgetting the bairns."

Most of his other letters are pretty much of the same character.

Sir Philip Francis left London for Bengal, in India, about the 10th day of June, 1774, as one of the Commissioners. On arriving there, he set up quite an establishment in the way of a residence, according to what he says in one of his letters on the subject.

PHILIP FRANCIS TO JOHN BOURKE

Calcutta, March 20, 1776

"Here I live, Master of the finest house in Bengal, with a hundred servants, a country house and spacious gardens, horses and carriages—yet so perverse is my nature that the devil take me if I would not exchange the best dinner and best company I ever saw in Bengal for a beefsteak and claret at the Horn and let me choose my company.

"An extraordinary stroke of fortune has made me independent. Two years more will probably raise me to affluent circumstances."

Writing to Mr. D. Godfrey, he explains what the "extraordinary stroke of fortune" had been: "You must know, my friend, that on one blessed day of the present year of our Lord (1776), I had won about 20,000 pounds at Whist. It is reduced to about 12,000 pounds, and I now never play but for trifles, and that only once a week."

His biographer says: "Philip Francis's life in India had, upon the whole, been a disappointing one; even as early as in the year 1775, only two years after his arrival, he wrote to Mr. D'Oyle: 'I am unable to express to you how weary I am of my situation.'"

From the foregoing letter he seems to have spent much of his time in riotous living, although he was getting a salary of ten thousand pounds, equal to $50,000 per annum, for *services to the Government.* It was not long before a friction ensued between him and Warren Hastings, the head of the Commission. The breach kept widening between them until all social intercourse was cut off, and there were frequent clashes between them in their official capacities, which injured the services they were sent there to perform. Finally

the mutual ill feeling reached its climax. Hastings accused Francis of not telling the truth about some matter, and Francis challenged him to fight a duel.

"The opposition which was made by Francis to the proceedings on the Jumma brought to a crisis the animosities which the struggle between him and the Governor General had so long maintained. On July 20th, 1780, Mr. Hastings, in answering a minute of Francis, declared, 'I do not trust to his promise of candour, convinced that he is incapable of it. I judge of his public conduct by my experience of his private, which I have found to be devoid of truth and honour.' The ground of these severe expressions, the Governor General stated to be a solemn agreement formed between him and Mr. Francis, which Mr. Francis had broken." Page 192, Vol. II in "Francis's Letters.' "

PHILIP FRANCIS'S JOURNAL

"August 15th, 1780

"Revenue Board. When it [the council] was over I took him (Hastings) into a private room and read to him the following words: 'Mr. Hastings, I am preparing a formal answer to the paper you sent me last night. As soon as it can be finished I shall lay it before you; but you must be sensible, sir, that no answer I can give to the matter of that paper can be adequate to the dishonour done me by the terms you have made use of. You have left me no alternative but to demand personal satisfaction of you for the affronts you have offered me.'

"As soon as I had read the preceding words to Mr. Hastings, he said he expected the demand, and was ready to answer it. We then agreed to meet on the morning of Thursday the 17th. I told him that I should desire Colonel Watson our chief *Ingenier* to attend me.

"Mention the affair to Watson, who happened to dine with me today—he agrees to provide pistols, in order to prevent suspicion.

"16th. Employed in settling my affairs, burning papers, etc., in case of the worst. Dull work. This evening Mr. Hastings orders his minute to be recorded.

"17th. Arrive at the ground near Belvedere, near an hour before Mr. H., who comes about 6 with Colonel Pearce. Watson marks out a distance of 14 common paces: the same he said at which Mr. Fox and Mr. Adam stood. My pistol missing fire, I changed it. We then fired together, and I was wounded and fell. I thought my backbone was broke, of course that I could not survive it. After the first confusion had subsided, and after I had suffered great inconvenience from being carried to the wrong place, I was at last conveyed to Major Tolley's house on a bed. The surgeons arrived in about an hour and a half from the time I was wounded, and cut out the ball and bled me twice in the course of the day. Mr. Hastings sends to know when he may visit me." Page 308, "Francis's Letters."

After Francis had recovered sufficiently from his severe wound, he returned to London on October 18th, 1781.

"With the return of Francis to England his official life ended. It had been a singularly checquered career; violent, ambitious, but in the end unsuccessful.

"He returned to England an unpopular and discountenanced man. The Governor General, whom he had so fiercely opposed, had hosts of friends, both in Parliament and the India House, and a considerable amount of favour with the public." . . . . Page 203, Vol. II, "Francis's Letters."

No one spoke to him on his return except the King and Edmund Burke.

Afterwards, he was elected as a Member of the House of Commons from Isle of Wright. Articles of impeachment were filed against Warren Hastings in Parliament, for malfeasance in office. While in Parliament, Francis took a very active part in this prosecution. He even tried to get on a committee to which the question was referred, but it was thought best to leave him off, on account of his strong prejudices against Hastings. The Committee, however, availed

themselves of his services in getting up evidence in making out their report.

After the Committee returned their report, Francis made some violent speeches on the subject. Others were also made by different members of Parliament, but after several years of contention, Hastings was acquitted, which was very mortifying to Francis.

Although he took a very active part in Parliament, and made speeches on many questions before them, he did not make much reputation. His biographers, in the "Memoirs of Francis," have this to say: "His life was a failure." Lord Thurlow said: "That it would have been a fortunate thing for England if the vessel which took Francis, Monson and Clavering to India, as Commissioners, had sunk before reaching there." Vol. II, page 268, "Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis." He lived to quite an old age.

It would be irksome to me to recapitulate the many reasons which I have assigned to show that Francis was not Junius, even if I had the space in this book; besides, I fear it would be tedious for the reader to go over them again. Therefore, I will revert to only one of them, which, I firmly believe is perfectly conclusive of the question at issue. I REFER TO THE LETTER FROM SIR PHILIP FRANCIS HIMSELF, ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR OF THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, IN ANSWER TO HIS LETTER ON THE SUBJECT, TO FRANCIS, WHICH IS AS FOLLOWS: "THE GREAT CIVILITY OF YOUR LETTER INDUCES ME TO ANSWER IT, WHICH, IF I WOULD REFER MERELY TO ITS SUBJECT MATTER, I SHOULD HAVE DECLINED. WHETHER YOU WILL ASSIST IN GIVING CURRENCY TO A SILLY, MALIGNANT FALSEHOOD IS A QUESTION FOR YOUR OWN DISCRETION. TO ME IT IS A MATTER OF PERFECT INDIFFERENCE.

"I AM YOURS, ETC.,

P. FRANCIS."

Leaving out the overwhelming proofs which I have added from cold facts and circumstances and from convincing arguments of the very best critics and ablest writers on

the subject, I would be willing to "rest my case," as the lawyers say, on the foregoing letter of Mr. Francis to the Editor of the "Monthly Magazine."

I cannot conceive how any fair minded person could possibly construe the above answer to mean anything else than a positive and unequivocal No! that he was not the author of the Junius Letters.

Before quitting this branch of my subject, I will make a very apt quotation from Junius: "It would be 'piling reluctant quarto upon solid folio' were I to say anything more, or adduce other facts on this intricate subject; besides, I do not wish to over-burden my readers with any superfluous matter. *Quantum sufficit.*"

I have now taken up and carefully considered all the arguments, assertions and surmises made by Mr. Taylor, H. R. Francis and other commentators on the subject (they produced no facts), in their vain attempts to prove that Sir Philip Francis was the author of the Junius Letters, and I believe that I have successfully refuted every one of them. Therefore, I will conclude Part II, and commence the discussion of Part III of my subject.

PART III

PART III.—PAINE

I now come to Part III of my subject, in which I suggest the name of Thomas Paine, the immortal patriot, statesman and philosopher, as the real author of the "Junius Letters," who did as much with his pen as our own dear Washington did with his sword, to achieve the *Independence of America*. It has truly been said, by a great author, that "The pen is mightier than the sword."

Before entering into the discussion of this branch of my subject, I thought it might interest my readers to learn when, where and how I came to "fix upon" Thomas Paine as the author of those remarkable Letters. In 1853, an uncle of mine, who lived in Indiana, visited our old home in Virginia, and while there he invited me to return with him for a visit of six months, which I accepted, as I had just finished my education in the High School, and wanted a vacation before entering college. On my arrival there, I found that he had a large and well selected library, and being very fond of reading, I spent much of my time with the books, while he was out on his plantation, attending to his large farming interests. He called my attention to the "Junius Letters," which I read with much interest and pleasure. I then read several other books, and finally picked out the "Political Works of Thomas Paine," which I eagerly devoured, as they were a revelation to me, as a boy about eighteen years old. Having carefully read them through, it occurred to me that I had recently read something very similar in style, and in subject matter; finally it dawned upon me that it was the "Junius Letters." I then commenced to review them, and quickly discovered the great similarity of the style and subjects in both works. I soon became convinced that they were written by one and the same

person, who, in my opinion, was Thomas Paine. I also perceived that they had almost the same objects in view.

Junius attempted to revolutionize the English Government, in which he partly succeeded. Paine attempted to revolutionize the American Colonies, about two years later, in which he entirely succeeded; by his masterly pen and otherwise, he contributed greatly towards emancipating them from the tyranny of Great Britain, and establishing them as "The free and Independent United States of America."

The chronology of Junius and Paine, their residence, etc., coincided exactly; and the age of Mr. Paine was suitable for both of those remarkable achievements. These facts and circumstances made a strong and lasting impression on my mind at the time, and in after years I began to think of writing something on the subject, whenever I could find the time, which did not occur until recently, when I took up the subject to employ some of my leisure hours, and for my own gratification, rather than for the emoluments which I might receive from it. I commenced to gather all the facts and information within my reach, in order to prove my contention that Thomas Paine was the author of those very celebrated Letters. I called on Brentanos, extensive book-sellers in New York City, and gave them a list of the books which I needed, a few of which they had on hand, but most of them, I was informed, would have to be procured from abroad, especially from London, where the Junius Letters were written and published. They proceeded to fill my order, and after some time, succeeded in finding them, at considerable expense, as nearly all of them were out of print, and had to be procured from private persons. A copy of "Junius Identified by Taylor" was in a dilapidated condition when I received it; both of the backs were missing, so I had to have it rebound. Price of book, only $6.00!

Before going into further discussion of this subject, I wish to state that I am perfectly aware of the existence of a small book, called "Junius Unmasked," in which the author, who does not give his name, endeavors to prove that Thomas

THOMAS PAINE AT ABOUT 38 YEARS

Copied from a photograph taken from a life-size waxen effigy made by the Eden Musee Company, in New York, for the Museum of the Thomas Paine National Historical Association, at the New Rochelle, New York.

Paine was the author of the Junius Letters, and also, of the Declaration of Independence. Right here, let me assure my readers, on honor, that I never heard of, or saw the book until several months after I commenced writing my discussion on the subject, when, accidently, I noticed it in an index of authors in the "Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine," which I was using in writing my book. Immediately I wrote Brentanos, book-sellers in New York, to send it to me, which they did. I found, on examination, that it was written in 1872, and was published in the same year, by John Gray & Co., in Washington, D. C. From what I have written above, it will be perceived that I claim to have discovered that Thomas Paine *was* the author of the Letters, in 1853, which was nineteen years before "Junius Unmasked" was written. I will further state that I never had any information or intimation, from any source whatever, that Paine was Junius. Therefore, the discovery of Paine was *original* with me. I will refrain from making any criticism on the above named book.

Before I commenced writing this book, I read everything within my reach on the subject, and made very copious notes as I proceeded, which took me over a year. Afterwards I spent several weeks in analysing what I had read, and the notes which I had taken, in order that I might make no mistake, before beginning the discussion of my subject. As I progressed, it became more and more apparent to me, that I was right in my conjecture as to the real author of the Junius Letters, until it appeared as clear and straight as a ray of light to my mind. Not until then did I begin the preparation of this volume. Inasmuch as there is no positive proof of the identity of Junius, my readers will hardly expect to find that continuity in my discussion which they *would* find, were the conditions otherwise. In the first place, I feel constrained to give a short biographical sketch of *my* real author of the Letters:

He was born at Thetford, England, not far from London, on the 29th day of January, 1737; one author says the 29th day of January, 1736; his father was a man of fine

character, of a good education, and of very liberal intelligence. He belonged to the Society of Friends, the Quakers; his mother was a Miss Frances Cocke, daughter of a respectable attorney of Thetford. Young Paine was in due time confirmed by the Bishop of Norwich, in the Episcopal Church, of which his mother was a member; he was educated at Thetford Grammar School, in which he was taught all the usual branches of learning, including the Latin language, in all of which he became quite proficient. His biographer says that he received a "good moral education, and a tolerable stock of useful learning from his father." Young Paine improved his opportunity in literature, and became very fond of reading the best political authors; he was especially fond of astronomy and geography. His father was a stay-maker, that is, a manufacturer of cordage, then extensively used in making ship sails for vessels on the coast, in which business young Paine assisted him, at intervals of time. When about eighteen years old, he went to London and entered into business with a Mr. Morris, a noted stay-maker, in which he soon became an adept, and followed it quite successfully for a few years. Afterwards he went into the same business for himself, at Sandwich, in Kent, England, in which he prospered very considerably, but it gave him no time to cultivate his literary taste. Later on, he received an appointment as Exciseman under the English Government, which gave him a great deal of leisure for reading, studying and writing, which he improved to the best advantage.

The fact is, that Robert Burns, the great Scottish poet, was likewise an Exciseman, which gave him time to write most of his beautiful poems and letters. The Excisemen of England then numbered several thousand, and there was considerable dissatisfaction among them as to their compensation in the business. They soon recognized the literary ability of their associate, Thomas Paine, and induced him to prepare a petition to Parliament "To have the state of their salaries taken into consideration," which he did in a very able and elaborate style. See page 79 of the "Poetical

and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine." Not long after presenting this petition to Parliament, Paine was dismissed by the Government from the service as Exciseman. No public reason was ever assigned for his dismissal. It has been said by a clever author, and we may reasonably conclude, that it was on account of the petition for an increase of their salaries, which, if raised only in a moderate amount to each Exciseman, would result in a very large sum in the aggregate for several thousand persons. Not long after his dismissal from the service, he made an application to the Government to be re-instated, a copy of which, in part, is as follows:

PETITION TO THE BOARD OF EXCISE

"Honourable Sirs:

The time I enjoyed my former commission was short and unfortunate—an officer only a single year. No complaint of the least dishonesty, or intemperance ever appeared against me; and if I am so happy as to succeed in this very humble petition, I will endeavour that my future conduct shall as much engage your Honor's approbation, as my former has merited your displeasure.

"I am your Honor's most dutiful, humble servant,

THOMAS PAINE."

London, July 3, 1766.

Shortly thereafter he received a new commission, which he held for some little time. After leaving the Excise, he taught in a female Seminary in London, about two years. It would interest any one very much to read all he had to say to Parliament about raising the salaries of the Excisemen. It embraces many pages, and his arguments are very lucid and cogent.

Paine wrote a number of other articles on various subjects discussed, while he lived in London; and were I only to name them, they would cover almost a page, all of which may be seen in a book of 460 pages, entitled "Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine." It also contains some excellent pieces of poetry written by him.

I will recite, for the benefit of the reader, a few of the most important subjects on which he wrote, and endeared himself to the hearts of the American people, viz: "Common Sense," "The American Crisis," and "Rights of Man," "A Peace Congress of all Nations," "Coast Defences," "A National Bank," etc. He was the intimate friend and adviser of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Monroe, and other leaders in the cause of American independence.

Before going further into the discussion of this part of my subject, I will copy the Preface to a very old volume, published in 1826, by Peter Roynold, Tannatt & Company, at Springfield, Massachusetts, entitled, "Political Works of Thomas Paine." This volume I regard as the most reliable and authentic of any that I have seen, because it was published while the life, character and writings of Thomas Paine were fresh in the minds of the people.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK

"The primary object and design of the publisher of this work is to awaken the attention of the American people, and to enable them to form a just view of the character and political labours of the immortal Thomas Paine, one of the principal founders of the American Republic. Had the generous and successful efforts of the illustrious author of 'Common Sense' been wanting, it is probable that our beloved country would have been, at this time, groaning under the sickly and senseless pageantry of monarchy, instead of enjoying the choicest blessings of liberty.

"The publisher most respectfully recommends to the American citizen generally, and to the youth of our country particularly, to peruse with feelings of the deepest interest, the political works of the late Thomas Paine. They will find in them a most valuable treasure: a text-book for themselves and their children. By such a procedure only, can they justly appreciate the invaluable political services of their great and good benefactor.

"No well regulated mind can fail to reverence the man who first taught their fathers the important political truth,

THOMAS PAINE AT ABOUT 56 YEARS

From a drawing by Gaspard after the celebrated painting by Romney.

"The World is My Country;
To Do Good My Religion."
—Thomas Paine.

that '*Kings are but men*, and not unfrequently, the *very worst of men*.' The man therefore, who is ungrateful to the being whose potent pen dispelled the mists of prejudice, and electrified our country with the love of independence; and was the earliest, the most faithful, and able advocate of the superiority and purity of the republican system of government, must labour under the dominion of the most narrow and pernicious prejudices, must be a stranger to the love of liberty, and unacquainted with all of the finer sensibilities of our nature."

There is another volume called "Principal Political Works of Thomas Paine," containing over 600 pages, devoted principally to his "Common Sense" and "American Crisis" pamphlets, and his "Rights of Man," to which I will refer the reader for his perusal.

I will here quote what different authors have written about Thomas Paine:

The late lamented lost Elbert Hubbard, in his booklet "Thomas Paine, the Great Commoner of Mankind," says: "The legislature of Pennsylvania voted Paine an honorarium of three thousand dollars, and the University of Pennsylvania awarded him the degree of M. A., in recognition of eminent services to literature and human rights." John Quincy Adams said: "Paine's pamphlet, 'Common Sense,' crystallized public opinion and was the first factor in bringing about the Revolution." When independence was declared, Mr. Paine enlisted as a private soldier, but was soon made aid-de-camp to General Greene. He was an intrepid and effective soldier, and took an active part in various battles. In December, 1776, he published his first pamphlet, "The American Crisis," the first words of which have gone into the electrotype of human speech, commencing with the following words: "These are the times that try men's souls," etc.

The intent of "The Crisis" was to infuse courage into the sinking spirits of the soldiers of Washington, who ordered Paine's book to be read at the head of every regiment, which

was done. On June the 8th, 1780, Paine started a subscription list and headed it with $500.00, all the money he then had, to feed Washington's starving army. The total amount subscribed was a little over one million five hundred thousand dollars. This sum averted disaster, until the loan was procured from France, which Paine helped to secure, by a visit to Louis XVI. Paine was the first one in favor of universal peace, and an end of all war and militarism.

Paine published in England, in 1791, two books known as "Rights of Man," Part I and Part II, in reply to Edmund Burke's "Thoughts on the Revolution in France," which reply by Paine was the greatest political treatise ever written. Paine was outlawed by England, and was prosecuted for writing it, but the prosecution was finally dropped. In a little pamphlet edited by the "Thomas Paine National Historical Association," the following eulogy is written on "Common Sense": "Thomas Paine was one of the founders of the great American Republic. Had it not been for his great efforts in liberty's behalf, it is quite as likely as not that to this very day this land would have remained under British rule. Thomas Paine wrote and published in January, 1776, the earliest plea for American independence. This was his pamphlet entitled 'Common Sense.' Previous to the appearance of Paine's masterly argument urging immediate separation and resistance, the American Colonists, notwithstanding the impositions of Great Britain (unbearable taxations, etc.) had thought only of supplications and petitions to George III for relief. Despite the British Monarch's long-continued obduracy, and the fact that each new oppression was followed by another, and that he turned a deaf ear to all appeals, the Colonists still hoped on, with never a thought of rebellion. *Even Washington*, at this time, expressed loyalty to the King. Like a thunderbolt from the sky came Paine's magnificent argument for liberty. It electrified the people, and its stirring words swept like wildfire through the country. No pamphlet ever written sold in such vast numbers, nor did any ever before or since produce such marvellous results. Paine donated all the financial proceeds of the pamphlet to

the cause of liberty (as he did with all of his other books). Washington, now converted, wrote to his friends in praise of 'Common Sense,' asserting that Paine's words were 'Sound doctrine and unanswerable reasoning.' Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Franklin, Madison, all the great statesmen of the time, wrote praisefully of Paine's 'flaming arguments.' In July, six months after 'Common Sense' had awakened the people, the Declaration of Independence, embracing the chief arguments of Paine's great pamphlet, and much of its actual wording, was signed by the committee of patriots in Philadelphia. The great Revolution commenced at once. The oppressed Colonists took up arms at a great disadvantage, by reason of lack of food, clothes, money and munitions of war; but, inspired by the forceful message of 'Common Sense,' they fought bravely and well. When winter set in, however, the ill-clad, poorly nourished little army had been greatly reduced in numbers by desertions from its ranks. Many of the soldiers were shoeless and left bloody footprints on the snow-covered line of march. All were but half-hearted at this time and many utterly discouraged. Washington wrote most apprehensively concerning the situation to the Congress. Paine, in the meantime (himself a soldier, with General Greene's army on the retreat from Fort Lee, N. J., to Newark) realizing the necessity of at once instilling renewed hope and courage in the soldiers, if the cause of liberty were to be saved, wrote by camp-fire at night, the first number of his soul-stirring 'Crisis' commencing with the words: 'These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot, will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country, but he that stands it *now* deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like Hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as *freedom* should not be highly rated.'

Washington ordered the 'Crisis' read aloud to every regiment of the army.

"The effect was magical. Hope was renewed in every breast. Deserters returned to the ranks, men who had half-heartedly withheld from joining the patriot army took courage from Paine's thrilling words and shouldered muskets with the rest. The great cause, tottering on the brink of dissolution, was saved. Paine's 'Crisis' did it. Following the first number of the 'Crisis' came others—thirteen in all—the last commencing with the words: 'The times that tried men's souls are over.' Paine was not only a great author and statesman, but he was distinctively a pioneer, an originator, an inventor and creator. To him we are indebted for many of the world's greatest ideas and reforms. Paine first proposed and first wrote the words 'United States of America': he first proposed the purchase of the Louisiana territory; first suggested the Federal Union of States. Much more might be told of this wonderful man, but this is merely a little leaflet, not a biographical volume. For a century the world has ignored this brilliant mind. It is time the world awakened to his merits. With that end in view, the Thomas Paine National Historical Association was organized and incorporated in New York some years ago. Through the efforts of this Association, Thomas Paine is at last coming into his own. The Association intends that Thomas Paine shall occupy that niche in the world's Temple of Fame, where he properly belongs, and to that end, it bends its every endeavor. The Association has established at New Rochelle, N. Y., in the house that Paine built on the farm presented him by the State of New York, in recognition of his patriotic services, a Thomas Paine National Museum. Admission is free. The Association publishes pamphlets and other literature from time to time on the subject of Thomas Paine. On January 29th, Paine's birthday, the Association has a commemorative meeting in Paine's honor at the Paine Monument in New Rochelle. The expenses of the Association are defrayed by the receipts from membership dues. The officers receive no remuneration for their services.

The membership dues are only one dollar a year (no initiation or other fees). The Association solicits members from all parts of the country. You have merely to send your name and one dollar for yearly dues to the Treasurer, and you will be enrolled as a member. Address Thomas Paine National Historical Association, 62 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y."

In August, 1914, I had the pleasure of visiting the Museum of Thomas Paine National Historical Association, which is located at New Rochelle, N. Y., in the old Thomas Paine residence, which has been removed from its original site to a point near where he was buried, and where the Association has erected a beautiful marble monument to his memory; on which, is the same inscription which was originally on his tombstone, as requested by Paine in his will. This inscription is simply "Thomas Paine, Author of 'Common Sense,' Died June 8th, 1809, aged 72 years and 5 months." The old residence, near by, is in a good state of preservation. It contains a complete Museum, which is kept open all the time, and where the visitor, who is always welcomed by the keeper, can see many old pictures and paintings of the great author of "Common Sense," as well as many of his writings, and a large number of curios, which were associated with his life. On my visit there, I was particularly struck with a waxen effigy of Paine, which was formerly in the Eden Musee, in New York, and was bought by some admirer of Paine and presented to the Association. It is a very artistic likeness of him when he was about thirty-five years old. It is life-size, sitting in a chair by a table, on which is a candle and candle-stick, with ink and paper on the table. He is holding a quill pen in his hand, as if he had just quit writing. It is said to be a "Speaking likeness of him." His figure, hair, eyes and the complexion are perfect. I got a very good picture of it while there, which I have reproduced in this book, in order that the reader may see what a magnificent specimen of manhood he was.

I consider it a duty of every native-born American citizen to join this Association, which costs only one dollar a year, and help perpetuate the memory of the great patriot, statesman and philosopher, who contributed so much to the sacred cause of freedom in America.

Mr. Wm. M. Vander Weyde, President of Thomas Paine National Historical Association, in his pamphlet "Who Wrote the Declaration of Independence?" says: "Thomas Paine was one of Jefferson's closest and most intimate friends. He was the most brilliant writer in the Colonies, author of that remarkable pamphlet 'Common Sense,' urging separation and independence from Great Britain, a pamphlet so virile and powerful that its effect has never been paralleled in literary history. Paine's writings were marked by their lucidity, logic and sound reasoning. All his arguments were presented with such force, simplicity of statement and incontrovertible deductions of fact, that his magic pen was hailed on every hand as the instrument of the country's salvation." In his pamphlet, Mr. Vander Weyde contends very artfully and plausibly that the Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Paine. Several other writers have enunciated the same doctrine, among whom, are Van Buren Denslow, Joel Moody, William H. Burr, James Edgerton and Albert Payson Terhune, but I hardly agree with those gentlemen, because I think it would have "leaked out" by some positive proof by Paine or Jefferson, and besides, it seems reasonable that a great statesman, and a thorough Virginian, like Thomas Jefferson, would have awarded to Thomas Paine, his friend, the honor of the production of this immortal document. However, I believe that Mr. Jefferson obtained some of his ideas from the writings of Mr. Paine, who was the first person who dared to advise and urge the American Colonies to withdraw their allegiance from Great Britain, and declare their independence, and did all in his power to help them to accomplish that end. It is difficult for me to believe that Thomas Jefferson should have permitted the distinguished honor of writing the Declaration of Independence to have abided

THE AUTHOR

at the old homestead of Thomas Paine, at New Rochelle,
New York, in August, 1914.

with him, if, in fact, it belonged to his friend, Thomas Paine. Therefore, I do not feel warranted in plucking a laurel from the brow of Jefferson, the great apostle of democracy, even to add another jewel to the crown of Paine, the *greater* statesman and philosopher. If I could consistently do so, I would gladly appropriate this distinguished honor for Thomas Paine. But when I turn to Vol. I of the "Life of Thomas Jefferson" by that astute writer, Henry S. Randall, LL.D., I find much to convince me otherwise. As this question is entirely foreign to my subject, I will not burden my readers with a discussion of it.

It may be of interest to the reader to know what other prominent writers have said about Thomas Paine; therefore I will recite the opinions of a few of them. Robert Cheatham, an English writer, had the following to say of Paine's "Common Sense": "It spoke a language which the American Colonists had felt but not thought. Its popularity, terrible in its consequences to the parent country [Great Britain] was unexampled in the history of the press. At first involving the Colonists, it was thought, in the cause of rebellion, and pointing a road leading inevitably to ruin, it was read with indignation and alarm, but when the reader [and everybody read it] recovering from the first shock, reperused it, its arguments, surmounting his feelings and appealing to his pride, re-animated his hopes and satisfied his understanding that 'Common Sense,' backed by the resources and force of the Colonies, poor and feeble as they were, could alone rescue them from the unqualified oppression with which they were threatened. The unknown author, in the moments of enthusiasm which succeeded, was held as an angel sent from Heaven, to save from all the horrors of slavery, by his timely, powerful and unerring counsels, a faithful, but abused, a brave, but misrepresented people."

John Adams was supposed to be the author of "Common Sense" but he replied: "I could not have written anything in so manly and striking a style." Randall, in his "Life of Jefferson," says: "A more effective appeal never went to the bosom of a nation. Its tone, its manner, its

Biblical allusions, its evidence of an openly impassioned appeal to feelings, and its unanswerable *common sense*, were exquisitely adapted to the great audience to which it was addressed. And calm investigation will satisfy the historical student, that its effect, in preparing the popular mind for the Declaration of Independence, exceeded that of any other paper, speech or document made to favor it, and it would scarcely be an exaggeration to add, than all other such means put together." Washington also spoke of "Common Sense" in the very highest praise, as a document to convince the hesitating Colonies that it was their duty to separate themselves from the dominion of Great Britain.

History records that just prior to the time of the appearance of "Common Sense," even Washington himself was strongly in favor of compromising the difference between the American Colonies and Great Britain, but after reading the powerful appeals of Paine to the people, he soon became an advocate of separation from the parent country.

I will refer my kind readers to Part I of this argument, where I have expressed my opinion of *Junius* and his Letters, and in order to condense this subject as much as possible, I will here adopt the text of that opinion, and consider that it is repeated here, as it is entirely applicable to Thomas Paine, inasmuch as I am thoroughly convinced that Junius and Paine are identically one and the same person. Of course, we must take into consideration the fact that, although their subjects were close of kin, still, they were not identical.

In addition to the valuable services which Paine did by his writings, under the name of "Common Sense," for the Colonies, he aided them in other most substantial ways. He gave the copyright of these pamphlets to the Colonies. He had 500,000 copies printed and sold, which realized the enormous sum of $250,000.00, out of which, he retained only the bare cost of publication, and the balance went to carry on the war for independence. Besides, he headed a subscription with $500.00 from his private means, which was circulated throughout the country, and reached the enormous

sum of $1,500,000 which went to the support of the army. Had it not been for the help which Paine contributed toward the support of the army, and the expenses of the Government, the Colonies would never have achieved their independence, but would have remained in abject slavery to England.

The subscribers to the above amount had themselves incorporated into "The Bank of America," which was originated by Mr. Paine, and with this money, and what was realized from Paine's writing, the war was carried on by the young nation, until funds were procured from France.

The historian informs us that shortly after the first pamphlet was issued, it was followed by a second, a third and a fourth, in proper order. They all breathed the language of revolution against, and independence of, the Government of England. Soon the people began to lean towards his doctrines. They saw in these pamphlets "A lamp unto their feet and a light unto their path," which was to lead them out of the wilderness of oppression into the land of liberty and independence, almost as miraculously as the children of Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage. And notwithstanding they had some doubts, they "Took counsel of their hopes," and many town meetings were held to consider what steps should be taken to meet the crisis then before them. The historian says, that soon after these pamphlets reached Albany, N. Y., a great excitement prevailed among the people, and a mass meeting of the citizens was called to take the matter into consideration; that after much discussion, a committee was appointed to answer the arguments of "Common Sense," and after long deliberation they reported to the meeting that they could not be answered.

In order to express the matter more distinctly, I will quote what Calvin Blanchard says in his "Life of Paine":

"When the American Revolution had progressed as far as the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, John Adams, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin and George Washington, had met together to read the terrible dispatches they had received. Having done which, they pause in gloom and silence.

Presently Franklin speaks: 'What', he asks, 'is to be the end of all this? Is it to obtain justice of Great Britain, to change the Ministry, to soften a tax? Or is it for'—He paused; the word INDEPENDENCE yet choked the bravest throat that sought to utter it.

"At this critical moment, Paine enters. Franklin introduces him and he takes his seat. He well knows the cause of the prevailing gloom, and breaks the deep silence thus: '*These States of America must be independent of England*! This is the only *solution of this question*!' They all rise to their feet at this political blasphemy. But nothing daunted, he goes on; his eye lights up with patriotic fire as he paints the glorious destiny which America, considering her vast resources, ought to achieve, and adjures them to lend their influence to rescue the Western Continent from the absurd, unnatural, and unprogressive predicament of being governed by a small island, three thousand miles off. Washington leaped forward, and taking both his hands, besought him to publish these views in a book.

"Paine went to his room, seized his pen, lost sight of every other object, toiled incessantly, and in December, 1775, the work entitled 'Common Sense,' which caused the *Declaration of Independence*, and brought both people and their leaders face to face with the work they had to accomplish, was sent forth on its mission. 'That book,' says Dr. Rush, 'burst forth from the press with an effect that has been rarely produced by types and paper, in any age or country.' 'Have you seen the pamphlet, "Common Sense"? asked Major General Lee, in a letter to Washington; 'I never saw such a masterly, irresistible performance, it will, if I mistake not, in concurrence with the transcendent folly and wickedness of the Ministry, give the *coup de grace* to Great Britain. In short, I own myself convinced by the arguments of the necessity of separation." Mr. Blanchard continues: "The tribute of Paine's greatest enemy was in these words: 'The cannon of Washington was not more formidable to the British than the pen of the author of 'Common Sense.'

"It was at this crisis, this interval between fear and principle, that Thomas Paine, then unknown as a public character, published the pamphlet 'Common Sense.'

"This remarkable and inestimable production may be described from the anathemas of the enemies of liberty. It has received the highest possible praise from the pen of Cheatham, one of Thomas Paine's most venal and shameless calumniators, who thus characterizes the work: 'This pamphlet of forty-seven octavo pages, holding out relief by proposing INDEPENDENCE to an oppressed and despairing people, was published in January, 1776. Speaking a language which the Colonists had felt, but not thought, its popularity, terrible in its consequences to the mother country, was unexampled in the history of the press. At first involving the Colonists, it was thought, in the crime of rebellion, and pointing to a road leading inevitably to ruin, it was read with alarm and indignation, but when the reader (and everybody read it) recovering from the first shock, re-perused it, its arguments, ravishing his feelings and appealing to his pride, re-animated his hopes and satisfied his understanding, that 'Common Sense,' backed by the resources and force of the Colonies, poor and feeble as they were, could alone rescue them from the unqualified oppression with which they were threatened. The *unknown author*, in the moments of enthusiasm which succeeded, was hailed as an angel sent from Heaven to save from all of the horrors of slavery, by his timely, powerful, and unerring counsels, a faithful but abused, a brave but misrepresented people.'

"When 'Common Sense' *arrived at Albany*, the convention of New York was sitting there. General Scott, a leading member, alarmed at the boldness and novelty of its argument, mentioned his fears to several of his distinguished colleagues, and suggested a private meeting in the evening, for the purpose of writing an answer. They accordingly met, and Mr. McThesson read the pamphlet through. At first it was deemed necessary and expedient to answer it without delay, but casting about for the requisite arguments,

they concluded to adjourn and meet again. In a few evenings they re-assembled, but so rapid was the change of opinion in the Colonies at large in favor of independence, that they agreed not to oppose it."

Dr. Gordon in his History of the American Revolution, writes thus: "The publications which have appeared have greatly promoted the spirit of independency, but no one so much as the pamphlet under the signature of 'Common Sense,' written by Thomas Paine, an Englishman. Nothing could have been better timed than this performance—it has produced astonishing effects.

"Testimonies of this sort from friends and enemies could easily be multiplied, and proofs almost without end could be adduced to show how much the cause of mankind was promoted by Thomas Paine in thus assisting to lay the foundation of the American Republic,—the example of which, will in time be followed by every people on the earth. The principles maintained in 'Common Sense' are applicable to all times, and to all mankind. They should be carefully studied by every one who is at all desirous to possess that information without which he must ever remain a slave at heart."

"*Paine was the first to advise* the Americans to assert their *independence*," says Richard Carlile in his "Life of Paine." "This he did in his famous pamphlet, entitled 'Common Sense,' which, for its consequences and rapid effect, was the most important production that ever issued from the press. This pamphlet appeared at the commencement of the year 1776, and electrified the minds of the oppressed Americans. They had not ventured to harbor the idea of independence, and they dreaded war so much as to be anxious for reconciliation with Britain. One incident which gave a stimulus to the pamphlet 'Common Sense' was, that it happened to appear on the very day that the King of England's speech reached the United States, in which the Americans were denounced as rebels and traitors, and in which speech it was asserted to be the right of the Legislature to bind the Colonies in all cases whatsoever! Such

menace and assertion as this could not fail to kindle the ire of the Americans, and 'Common Sense' came forward to touch their feelings with the spirit of independence in the very nick of time."

In the meantime, England was sending troops and munitions of war to America, to subdue the Colonies, and the people became more and more restless. On the 19th day of April, 1775, the battle of Lexington was fought between a detachment of English soldiers and the citizen soldiery, several of whom were killed in the fight.

After the meeting at Albany adjourned, they advised active and open rebellion against Great Britain. Soon preparations were made for war, in resistance to their open enemy. General Washington was placed in charge of the troops, as they were raised and put into service. Meanwhile there was still a large number of citizens who had not joined the army. Many of them honestly feared the consequences, in the event that the patriotic little army of Washington should be defeated, and they, no doubt, hoped to escape most of the hardships which would be visited upon the army, and those who sympathized with them in "the cause." Others remained out of the army from sheer cowardice; there still was another class of citizens who took no interest in the terrible conflict, but did all they could to aid the British army. These were called "Tories," and were hated and despised by the patriots and all friends of "the cause." They were taunted for their meanness and infidelity to their country, and in many instances were prosecuted for their treasonable acts against the Government. Many of them left the country and their estates were confiscated. All the while Mr. Paine was writing by the light of the camp-fires, at night, paying particular attention to each class of these citizens, above referred to.

A convention was soon called by the Colonies to consider making a Declaration of Independence, and the establishment of a Provisional Government, under the advice of Mr. Paine and other leading patriots. At this convention, a committee was appointed for the purpose of drafting our

present Declaration of Independence. After due deliberation on the subject, the committee appointed Thomas Jefferson to draft the immortal document, which he did, and delivered it to a special meeting of the committee, and it was unanimously adopted by them, and on July 4th, 1776, it was published to the world, which gave birth to the free and Independent United States of America.

The war had progressed for about two years; dark clouds had begun to hover over the American people; England had quartered her troops in all of the principal cities. General Washington had met with several reverses in battle; his army was depleted by death, sickness and desertion; his soldiers were poorly fed, badly clothed and poorly paid; consequently they were greatly dejected in spirit. Many of the citizens began to fear that they had made a mistake in entering the conflict. At this juncture of affairs, Thomas Paine, who was in the army as a private soldier, again took up his pen, and by the light of the camp-fires, at night, began a series of sixteen pamphlets, which he called "The American Crisis," and were also signed "Common Sense." In these pamphlets he discussed the critical condition of the army and the country, and suggested methods and means for greatly improving their condition, and appealed strongly to the patriotism of the whole country to sustain "The cause" to the utmost of their ability, assuring them that under the Providence of God, they would come out victorious. He had printed over 5,000 of these remarkable pamphlets, and spread them broadcast all over the country. They were eagerly sought for, and more eagerly read by every one who could procure a copy.

It is impossible for me herein, even to comment on Paine's sixteen "Crisis Pamphlets," embracing 230 pages; every line of which should be carefully read by every American-born citizen who is now enjoying the inestimable blessings of Liberty, which these immortal documents did so much to achieve and to maintain. All the while Paine stood like a faithful sentinel on the watch-tower of liberty, and at every approach of danger he gave the alarm to the people, by

writing another stirring "Crisis," and distributing it among them, advising what should be done to complete and to preserve their Independence, which for seven long and dreary years, hung by a bare thread. However, I cannot refrain from copying a few extracts from those wonderful papers.

"Crisis" No. I was written in a great emergency, when General Washington's little army had recently met with several reverses in battle, by the overwhelming forces of the British army. His troops were worn out and very much depleted by being killed and wounded in various engagements, and by sickness and desertions. Consequently they, and the people in general, were very much disheartened, and scarcely knew which way to turn for support. Paine was a soldier, with them in the army, and was thoroughly acquainted with their sad condition—many of them being without shoes and very poorly clothed. He realized the necessity that something must be done, and that quickly, to inspire them and the country with hope and courage. At once he took up his pen, and while others were sleeping, he sat up at nights, by the camp-fire, and wrote the first of his very celebrated papers, known as the "Crisis," which commenced as follows: "These are the times that try men's souls."

The proceeds of the sale of these pamphlets, as they appeared from time to time, amounted to the sum of about $250,000, which he also donated to the support of the army and the Government. As they appeared, General Washington ordered them to be read at the head of every Company in his command, in order to cheer their drooping spirits, and nerve them to greater acts of heroism. Their influence acted like magic in the great struggle for freedom. The whole country became inspired with hope, and new life was injected into the army. It was resolved by the Congress to conduct the war to a "successful termination," which, as we all know, was finally accomplished, and we are to-day enjoying the full fruition of the benefits of liberty and independence, which our ancestors bequeathed to us. Who can

estimate the influence which "Common Sense" contributed to this glorious result?

All these wonderful pamphlets, as we have seen, were written by Thomas Paine over the signature "Common Sense," just as all the political Letters of Junius were written over that of "Junius." These pamphlets were attributed to several of the most illustrious patriots in the Colonies, among whom were Dr. Franklin, Samuel Adams, and John Adams, all of whom denied the authorship. Mr. Paine was very solicitous to keep the secret from becoming known, and for the very best reasons: he had the same motives for concealing his identity as the author of "Common Sense" which Junius had for concealing his identity with the name of "Junius." Paine feared he would be arrested by the authorities of Great Britain, then in America, and tried for promoting rebellion of the Colonies against the English Government. Very likely he would have been convicted and sent to London for imprisonment in the Tower, and perhaps it might have cost him his life. For the same reason Junius concealed his identity in England. After the Revolution had progressed far enough to insure his safety from arrest, Paine let it be known that he was the author. As I have before remarked, it has been said, "The pen is mightier than the sword." I am far from intending to disparage the great and immortal Washington, but I do honestly and conscientiously believe that the honor of achieving the independence of the American Colonies should be, at least, equally divided between Thomas Paine, as the author, and Washington, as the soldier, who accomplished these wonderful results. The former furnished the soldiers, by the urgent and patriotic appeals of his pen, and likewise contributed much of the money and supplies, through his influence, to feed and clothe the army, and the latter led them on to victory by his skill and valor.

I will call the attention of my readers to extracts from two letters commenting upon Lord North, as Prime Minister, one by Paine, the other by Junius; and although they were written some time apart, it will be observed that the same

vein of bitter sarcasm runs through both of them; and their style is identical.

In the VII "Crisis" Letter Paine says: "As for Lord North, it is his happiness to have in him more philosophy than sentiment, for he bears flogging like a top, and sleeps the better for it. His punishment becomes his support, for while he suffers the lash for his sins, he keeps himself up by twirling about in politics. He is a good mathematician, and in everything else, nothing at all." Now observe what Junius says of the same person. They are similar in their likes and dislikes.

In Letter I of *Junius*, he says of Lord North: "A leading Minister repeatedly called down for absolute ignorance, ridiculous motions, ridiculously withdrawn, deliberate plans disconcerted, a week's preparation of graceful oratory lost in a moment, gives us some, though not adequate ideas, of Lord North's parliamentary abilities and influence. Yet, before he had the misfortune of becoming Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was neither an object of derision to his enemies, nor a melancholy pity to his friends. I hope he, the Duke of Grafton [then Prime Minister], will not rely on the fertility of Lord North's genius for finance; his Lordship is yet to give us the first proof of his abilities." They are very similar in many other respects. Here I will compare the similarity of the religion of Paine and Junius.

In order to remove all prejudice from the minds of our church people, on account of the religious tenets held by Mr. Paine, I will make a short statement of his views on religion. He says: "I believe in one God and no more, and I hope for happiness beyond this life." "The world is my country, to do good is my religion." "All religions are in their nature mild and benign when not associated with political systems." "As to religion, I hold it to be the indispensable duty of all governments to protect all conscientious professors thereof, and I know of no other business which government has to do therewith."

Paine, in his Epistle to the Quakers, says: "The writer of this, is one of those few who never dishonors religion,

either by ridiculing or caviling at any denomination whatsoever. To God, and not to man are all men accountable on the score of religion." "Philo Junius," who was really Junius, in Letter No. 54 of his Private Letters, says, on religion: "If I thought Junius capable of uttering a disrespectful word of the religion of his country, I should be the first to renounce and give him up to the public contempt and indignation." Many of his letters show that he was a strong believer in God. On pages 251 and 252, "Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine," he says: "Do we want to contemplate His power? We see it in the immensity of the Creation. Do we want to contemplate His wisdom? We see it in the unchangeable order by which the incomprehensible whole is governed. Do we want to contemplate His munificence? We see it in the abundance with which He fills the earth. Do we want to contemplate His mercy? We see it in His not withholding that abundance even from the unthankful."

Remember, Paine was raised as a Quaker, which his father was, his mother being a member of the Established Church of England, and Paine was baptized in her Church. He was, what in this day, is called a Unitarian. He believed in God, but did not believe in the Trinity.

The Jewish religion is very similar. So is the religion of the Quakers.

Some one whose name I have omitted from my notes, says: "Thomas Paine was the legitimate ancestor of Hosea Ballou, who founded the Universal Church, and also of Theodore Parker, who made Unitarianism in America an intellectual torch."

It would be almost impossible for me to introduce the great number of instances of similarity between Junius and Paine. It would require the greater part of another volume to copy their writings touching the subject. I can only refer the reader to a few of them. *Vide* Crisis, Nos. V and I, III and VII, and Letters of Junius Nos. 68, 49, 35, 9, and 20 on Religion. They were not only alike in their religion,

but in their friendships and animosities, and in every peculiarity of their natures. Before commencing to write this book, I made a diligent search through all the works on the subject, which were at my command, to find anything which militated against my hypothesis, and I have found nothing,—everything confirmed it. If I had discovered even one fact, I most certainly would not have gone to the trouble, labor and expense of getting out this volume. And why? If I had not thoroughly convinced myself of the certainty of my theory, I could not expect to convince my readers. Any one uncertainty would have kept rising up before me, like the ghost of Banquo at the feast which would not down at the bidding of Macbeth. It would have stalked through my dreams by night, and haunted me by day. Besides, I have no ambition to try to convince anyone of a fallacy.

In a letter written by Junius on the 19th of December, 1769, "To the Printer of the Public Advertiser," which is known as his "Letter to the King," wherein he first speaks of the American Colonies "Looking forward to Independence," he says to George III: "They [the Colonies] consider you as united with your servants [the Ministry] against America; and know how to distinguish the Sovereign and a venal Parliament on one side, from the real sentiments of the English people on the other. Looking forward to independence, they might possibly receive you for their King; but, if ever you retire to America, be assured they will give you such a covenant to digest as the presbytery of Scotland would have been ashamed to offer to Charles the Second.—They left their native land in search of freedom, and found it in a desert. Divided as they are into a thousand forms of policy and religion, there is one point in which they all agree; they equally detest the pageantry of a King and the supercilious hypocrisy of a bishop." In November, 1774, this same Junius, in the person of Thomas Paine, came to America, as I have already stated, at the instance of Dr. Franklin, and soon espoused the cause of Independence of the American people, under the name of "Common Sense," carrying

out the same doctrines which Junius enunciated six years prior to this time, in his addresss to the King, above referred to.

Here I will discuss and copy some parts of the pamphlets of "Common Sense," which brought on the Revolutionary War.

If convenient, I would like for the critical reader to examine the first two pamphlets of "Common Sense," and observe how adroitly and wisely the author avoids even a suggestion of independence to the Colonies, until he led their minds up to the point where they saw its feasibility as he did, lest they should become alarmed at such a venture, and thereby he would lose all influence over them.

In his first pamphlet of "Common Sense," he discusses "The origin and design of Government, in general, with concise remarks on the English Constitution." He proceeds as follows, in parts of his discussion: "Some writers have so confounded society with Government, as to leave little or no distinction between them; whereas they are not only different, but have different origins. Society in every state is a blessing, but Government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil, in its worst state, an intolerable one; for when we suffer, we are exposed to the same miseries by *a Government*, which we might expect in a country *without Government*; our calamity is heightened by reflecting that we furnish the means of which we suffer. Government, like dress, is the badge of lost innocence; the palaces of Kings are built on the ruins of the bowers of paradise. . . . . Wherefore, security being the true design and end of Government, it unanswerably follows, that whatever *form* thereof appears most likely to ensure it to us with the least expense and greatest benefit, is preferable to all others." . . . .

His next suggestion relates to the tenure of office, by their representatives, which is identical with the views of Junius, as to the tenure of office, in the English Parliament. See page 3, Principal Political Works of Paine: "That the interest of every part of the colony may be attended to, it will be found best to divide the whole into convenient parts, each part sending its proper number; and that the

elected might never form to themselves an interest separate from the *electors*, prudence will point out the propriety of having elections often, because as the *elected* might by that means return and mix again with the general body of the *electors* in a few months, their fidelity to the public will be secured by the prudent reflection of not making a plot for themselves." . . . . Furthermore, it will be noticed by the reader that Junius and Paine both advocate having elections often, in order that the electors might not lose control of their representatives. On page 89, Vol. I of "Junius by Woodfall," Junius says: "With regard to any influence of the constituents over the conduct of the representatives, there is little difference between a seat in Parliament for seven years and a seat for life. The prospect of your resentment is too remote; and although the last session of a septennial Parliament be usually employed in courting the favour of the people, consider that, at this rate, your representatives have six years for offence, and but one for atonement. A death-bed repentance seldom reaches to restitution."

Paine, then fully discusses the difference betwen a Monarchial and a Republican form of Government.

"The prejudice of Englishmen in favor of their own Government by Kings, Lords and Commons, arises as much or more from national pride than reason." . . . .

His second "Common Sense" pamphlet is on "Monarchy and Hereditary Succession," which he discusses very elaborately, wherein he comes to the point of a "*Separation from England.*" He says: "To the evil of monarchy we have added that of hereditary succession; and as the first is a degradation and lessening of ourselves, so the second, claimed as a matter of right, is an insult and imposition on posterity. For all men being originally equals, no *one* by *birth* could have a right to set up his own family in perpetual preference to all others forever, and though himself might deserve *some* decent degree of honors of his contemporaries, yet his descendants might be far too unworthy to inherit them. One of the strongest *natural* proofs of the folly of hereditary

rights of kings, is that nature disapproves it, otherwise she would not so frequently turn it into ridicule by giving mankind *an ass for a lion*. . . . .

"England, since the conquest, hath known some good monarchs, but groaned beneath a much larger number of bad ones, yet no man in his senses can say that their claim under William the Conqueror is a very honorable one. A French bastard, landing with an armed banditti, and establishing himself King of England against the consent of the natives, is, in plain terms, a very paltry, rascally original. It is needless to spend much time in exposing the folly of hereditary right; if there are any so weak as to believe it, let them promiscuously worship the ass and the lion, and welcome." . . . ."I shall neither copy their humility nor disturb their devotion." . . . . "But it is not so much the absurdity as the evil of hereditary succession which concerns mankind. Did it ensure a race of good and wise men it would have the seal of divine authority, but as it opens a door to the *foolish*, the *wicked*, and the *improper*, it hath in it the nature of oppression. Another evil which attends hereditary succession is, that the throne is subject to be possessed by a minor of any age; all of which time the regency, under the cover of a king, have every opportunity and inducement to betray their trust. The same national misfortune happens when a king, worn out with age and infirmity, enters the last stage of human weakness. In both cases the public becomes the prey of every miscreant who can tamper successfully with the follies either of age or infancy." . . . . "The contest for monarchy and succession, between the houses of York and Lancaster, laid England in a scene of blood for many years. Twelve pitched battles, besides skirmishes and sieges, were fought between Henry and Edward, twice was Henry prisoner to Edward, who in his turn was prisoner to Henry." . . . . "The nearer any government approaches to a republic, the less business there is for a king. For it is the Republican and not the Monarchical part of the constitution of England which Englishmen glory in, viz: the liberty of choosing a

House of Commons from out of their own body—and it is easy to see that when republican virtue fails, slavery ensues. Why is the constitution of England sickly but because monarchy hath poisoned the republic, the Crown hath engrossed the Commons?" . . . . "In England a king hath little more to do than to make war and give away places; which, in plain terms, is to impoverish the nation and set it together by the ears." . . . . . "A pretty business indeed for a man to be allowed eight hundred thousand sterling a year for, and worshipped into the bargain! Of more worth is one honest man to society, and in the sight of God, than all the crowned ruffians that ever lived." Pages 12, 13, 14, 15 16, 17 and 18.

His third pamphlet embraces "Thoughts on the Present State of American Affairs." He says:

"In the following pages I offer nothing more than simple facts, plain arguments, and common sense; and have no other preliminaries to settle with the reader, than that he will divest himself of prejudice and prepossession, and suffer his reason and his feelings to determine for themselves. Volumes have been written on the subject of the struggle between England and America. Men of all ranks have embarked in the controversy, from different motives, and with various designs: but all have been ineffectual, and the period of debate is closed. Arms, as a last resource, must decide the contest; the appeal was the choice of the King, and the continent hath accepted the challenge." . . . . "The sun never shone on a cause of greater worth. 'Tis not the affair of a city, a county, a province, or a kingdom, but of a continent—of at least one eighth part of the inhabitable globe. 'Tis not the concern of a day, a year or an age; posterity are virtually involved in the contest, and will be more or less affected even to the end of time, by the proceedings now. Now is the seed time of continental union, faith and honor. I challenge the warmest advocate for reconciliation, to show a single advantage that this continent can reap by being connected with Great Britain. I repeat the challenge: not a single advantage is derived. Our corn will fetch its price

in any market in Europe, and our imported goods must be paid for, buy them where we will. But in injuries and disadvantages we sustain by that connection are without number, and our duty to mankind at large, as well as to ourselves, instructs us to renounce the alliance; because any submission to or dependence on Great Britain tends directly to involve this continent in European wars and quarrels; and sets us at variance with nations who would otherwise seek our friendship, and against whom we have neither anger nor complaint. Everything that is right or natural pleads for separation. The blood of the slain, the weeping voice of nature cries, *'tis time to part.* Even the distance at which the Almighty hath placed England and America is a strong and natural proof that the authority of the one over the other was never the design of heaven.

"Though I would carefully avoid giving unnecessary offense, yet I am inclined to believe, that all those who espouse the doctrine of reconciliation may be included within the following descriptions:

"Interested men, who are not to be trusted; weak men who *cannot* see; prejudiced men, who *will not* see; and a certain set of moderate men who think better of the European world than it deserves; and this last class, by an ill-judged deliberation, will be the cause of more calamities to this continent than all the other three.

"It is the good fortune of many to live distant from the scene of sorrow; the evil is not sufficiently brought to *their* doors to *make* them feel the precariousness with which all American property is possessed. But let our imaginations transport us for a few moments to Boston; the seat of wretchedness will teach us wisdom, and instruct us forever to renounce a power in whom we can have no trust. The inhabitants of that unfortunate city, who but a few months ago were in ease and affluence, have now no other alternative than to stay and starve, or turn out to beg.

"Men of passive tempers look somewhat lightly over the offences of Britain, and still hoping for the best, are apt to call out, *Come, come, we shall be friends again for all this.*

But examine the passions and feelings of mankind, bring the doctrine of reconciliation to the touch-stone of nature, and then tell me whether you can hereafter love, honor and faithfully serve the power that hath carried fire and sword into your land? If you cannot do all these, then you are only deceiving yourselves, and by your delay bringing ruin upon your posterity. Your future connection with Britain, whom you can neither love nor honor, will be forced and unnatural, and being formed only on the plan of present convenience, will in a little time fall into a relapse more wretched than the first. But if you say you can still pass the violations over, then I ask, Hath your house been burnt? Hath your property been destroyed before your face? Are your wife and children destitute of a bed to lie on, or bread to live on? Have you lost a parent or child by their hands, and yourself the ruined and wretched survivor? If you have not, then you are not a judge of those who have. But if you have, and can still shake hands with the murderers, then you are unworthy the name of husband, father, friend or lover, and whatever may be your rank or title in life, you have the heart of a coward, and the spirit of a sycophant.

"It is not in the power of Britain or of Europe to conquer America, if she does not conquer herself by *delay* and *timidity*. The present winter is worth an age if rightly employed, but, if lost or neglected, the whole continent will partake of the misfortune; and there is no punishment which that man will not deserve, be he who, or what, or where he will, that may be the means of sacrificing a season so precious and useful.

"It is repugnant to reason, to the universal order of things, to all examples from former ages, to suppose that this continent can longer remain subject to any external power. The most sanguine in Britain does not think so. The utmost stretch of human wisdom cannot at this time, compass a plan short of separation, which can promise the continent even a year's security. Reconciliation is *now* a fallacious dream. Nature hath deserted the connection, and art cannot supply her place. For, as Milton wisely expresses,

'Never can true reconcilement grow, where wounds of deadly hate have pierced so deep.'

"I am not induced by motives of pride, party or resentment to espouse the doctrine of separation and independence; I am, clearly, positively, and conscientiously persuaded that it is the truest interest of this continent to be so; that everything short of *that* is mere patchwork; that it can afford no lasting felicity, that it is leaving the sword to our children, and shrinking back at a time, when a little more, a little further, would have rendered this continent the glory of the earth.

"No man was a warmer wisher for reconciliation than myself before the fatal nineteenth of April, 1775 [massacre at Lexington], but the moment the event of that day was made known, I rejected the hardened, sullen-tempered Pharaoh of England forever; and disdain the wretch, that with the pretended title of *Father of his people*, can unfeelingly hear of their slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood upon his soul.

"There are thousands and tens of thousands who would think it glorious to expel from the continent that *barbarous* and *hellish* power which hath stirred up the Indians and negroes to destroy us; the cruelty hath a double guilt; it is dealing brutally by us and treacherously by them.

"O ye that love mankind! Ye that dare oppose, not only the tyranny, but the tyrant, stand forth! Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression." This is a very powerful appeal to the Colonies.

In his fourth pamphlet of "Common Sense" he treats "Of the present ability of America, with some miscellaneous reflections." In discusing the "Separation of the American Colonies from Great Britain," he says (page 38): "I have never met a man, either in England or America, who hath not confessed his opinion that separation between the countries would take place one time or other; and there is no instance in which we have shown less judgment, than in endeavoring to describe what we call the ripeness or fitness of the continent for independence.

"As all men allow the measure, a separation, and vary only in their opinion of the time, let us, in order to remove mistakes, take a general survey of things, and endeavor, if possible, to find out the *very* time. But we need not go far, the inquiry ceases at once, for the *time hath found us*. The general concurrence, the glorious union of all things proves the fact.

"It is not in numbers, but in unity, that our great strength lies."

In this pamphlet he makes his first suggestion of a Declaration of Independence by the Colonies (pages 48 and 49): "However strange it may appear to some, or however unwilling they may be to think so, matters not, but many strong and striking reasons may be given to show that nothing can settle our affairs so expeditiously as an open and determined *declaration for independence*. These proceedings may at first appear strange and difficult; but like all other steps which we have already passed over, will in a little time become familiar and agreeable. Until an independence is declared, the continent will feel itself like a man who continues putting off some unpleasant business from day to day, yet knows it must be done, hates to set about it, wishes it over, and is continually haunted with the thoughts of its necessity."

In his "Appendix" he discusses "The King's Speech" which had recently appeared in America, which was very bitter towards the Colonies. He says: "Since the publication of the first edition of this pamphlet, or rather, on the same day on which it came out, the King's speech made its appearance in this city. Had the spirit of prophecy directed the birth of this production, it could not have brought it forth at a more seasonable juncture, or at a more necessary time. The bloody-mindedness of the one, shows the necessity of pursuing the doctrine of the other. Men ready by way of revenge: and the speech, instead of terrifying, prepared a way for the manly principles of independence.

"Ceremony, and even silence, from whatever motives they may arise, have a hurtful tendency when they give the

least degree of countenance to base and wicked performances; wherefore, if this maxim be admitted, it naturally follows, that the King's speech, as being a piece of finished villainy, deserved and still deserves a general execration, both by the Congress and the people. The speech, if it be called one, is nothing better than a ***willful, audacious libel against the truth***, the common good, and the existence of mankind; and is a formal and pompous method of offering up human sacrifices to the pride of tyrants. However, it matters very little now, what the King of England either says or does; he hath wickedly broken through every moral and human obligation, trampled nature and conscience beneath his feet; and by a steady and constitutional spirit of insolence and cruelty, procured for himself an universal hatred. It is ***now*** the interest of America to provide for herself.

"The present state of America is truly alarming to every man who is capable of reflection. Without law, without government, without any other mode of power than what is founded on, and granted by, courtesy. Held together by an unexampled concurrence of sentiment, which is nevertheless subject to change, and which every secret enemy is endeavoring to dissolve. Our present condition is legislation without law; wisdom without a plan, a constitution without a name, and, what is strangely astonishing, perfect independence contending for dependence. The incidence is without a precedent; the case never existed before; and who can tell what may be the event?

"The property of no man is secure in the present unbraced system of things. It is the violence which is done and threatened to our persons; the destruction of our property by an armed force; the invasion of our country by fire and sword, which conscientiously qualifies the use of arms; and the instant in which such a mode of defence became necessary, all subjection to Britain ought to have ceased; and the *independence of America* should have been considered as dating its era from, and published by, the *first musket that was fired against her.*

"There are reasons to so be given in support of independence which men should rather privately think of, than be publicly told of. We ought not to be debating whether we shall be independent or not, but anxious to accomplish it on a firm, secure and honorable basis, and uneasy rather, that it is not yet begun upon. Every day convinces us of its necessity.

"In short, independence is the only *bond* that can tie and keep us together. We shall then see our object; and our ears shall be legally shut against the schemes of an intriguing, as well as a cruel enemy.

"Wherefore, instead of gazing at each other, with suspicious or doubtful curiosity, let each of us hold out to his neighbor the hearty hand of friendship, and unite in drawing a line, which, like an act of oblivion shall bury in forgetfulness every former dissension. Let the names of Whig and Tory be extinct; and let none other be heard among us, than those of a *good citizen*, an *open and resolute friend*, and *a virtuous supporter of the* RIGHTS OF MANKIND, and of the FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES OF AMERICA."

The last paragraph is a powerful appeal for friendship, even between the Whigs and the Tories, in order to have perfect unity of action in their approaching struggle for Independence.

Mr. Paine, whose father was a Quaker, wrote an "Epistle to Quakers" who were actively assisting the King and his minions in making open and cruel war on the Americans, and at the same time, were censuring the Americans for defending themselves against the merciless attacks of Great Britain, because they said *bearing arms was sinful.* He says: "O ye partial ministers of your own acknowledged principles! If the bearing of arms be sinful, the first going to war must be more so, by all the difference between wilful attack and unavoidable defence. Wherefore, if ye really preach from conscience, and mean not to make a political hobby-horse of your religion, convince the world thereof by proclaiming your doctrine to our enemies, *for they likewise bear arms.*"

Other parts of his epistle are very severe on the Quakers for assisting the King to carry on the war.

Here I shall likewise consider some of the pamphlets of "Common Sense," called "The Crisis": Paine wrote his first pamphlet, which he called "The Crisis," on the 23rd of December, 1776, about nine months after the battle of Lexington and something less than six months after the Declaration of Independence. General Washington had met with several reverses in battle,—his army was much depleted by being killed and wounded, by sickness and desertion. Those remaining true to the cause were very much discouraged, poorly clothed, poorly fed and poorly paid. Mr. Paine, then in the army, recognized the necessity of doing something to revive their drooping spirits, and to inspire more patriotism in the people generally. Thereupon he took up his pen again, by the camp-fire at night, when all were asleep around him, and commenced those immortal pamphlets known as "The Crisis" which he continued, at intervals, for five or six years, as the war progressed. It has frequently been said by the most distinguished patriots of those times, that had it not been for the efforts of Thomas Paine, at this critical juncture of affairs, America would never have achieved her independence.

These pamphlets were sixteen in number and embraced 230 pages, consequently, I can only make extracts from them, but the reader should, by all means, read every page of them, in order to appreciate their strength and beauty. The First "Crisis" commences as follows: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country, but he that stands it *now*, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: 'tis dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as FREEDOM should not be

highly rated. Britain, with an army to enforce her tyranny, has declared that she has a right (*not only to tax*) but 'to *bind* us *in all cases whatsoever*,' and *if being bound in that manner*, is not slavery, then is there not such a thing as slavery upon earth. Even the expression is impious, for so unlimited a power can belong only to God.

"I have as little superstition in me as any man living, but my secret opinion has ever been, and still is, that God Almighty will not give up a people to military destruction, or leave them unsupported to perish, who have so earnestly and so repeatedly sought to avoid the calamities of war, by every decent method which wisdom could invent. Neither have I so much of the infidel in me, as to suppose that He has relinquished the government of the world, and given us up to the care of the devils; and as I do not, I cannot see on what grounds the king of Britain can look up to Heaven for help against us: a common murderer, a highwayman, or a house-breaker, has as good a pretence as he.

"Why is it that the enemy have left the New England provinces, and made these middle ones the seat of war? The answer is easy: New England is not infested with Tories, and we are. I have been tender in raising the cry against these men, and used numberless arguments to show them their danger, but it would not do to sacrifice a world to either their folly or their baseness. The period is now arrived, in which either they or we must change our sentiments, or one or both must fall. And what is a Tory? Good God! What is he? I should not be afraid to go with a hundred Whigs against a thousand Tories, were they to attempt to get into arms. Every Tory is a coward; for servile, slavish, self-interested fear is the foundation of Toryism; and a man under such influence, though he be cruel, never can be brave.

"Quitting this class of men, the Tories, I turn with the warm ardor of a friend to those who have nobly stood, and are yet determined to stand the matter out: I call not upon a few, but upon all: not on *this* state or *that* state, but on *every* state; up and help us; lay your shoulders to the wheel;

of Britain may lay waste the world in blood and famine, and they, poor fallen souls, have nothing to say.

"Your avowed purpose here, is to kill, conquer, plunder, pardon and enslave: and the ravages of your army through the Jerseys have been marked with as much barbarism as if you had openly professed yourself the prince of ruffians; not even the appearance of humanity has been preserved either on the march or the retreat of your troops; no general order that I could ever learn, has ever been issued to prevent or even forbid your troops from robbery, wherever they came; and the only instance of justice, if it can be called such, which has distinguished you from impartiality, is, that you *treated* and *plundered* all alike: what could not be carried away has been destroyed, and mahogany furniture has been deliberately laid on fire for fuel, rather than the men should be fatigued with cutting wood.

"In a folio general-order book, belonging to Col. Rhol's battalion, taken at Trenton, and now in the possession of the council of safety for the state, the following barbarous order is frequently repeated: 'His excellency, the Commander-in-chief, orders that all inhabitants who shall be found with arms, not having an officer with them, shall be immediately taken and hung up.' How many you may thus have privately sacrificed, we know not, and the account can only be settled in another world. Your treatment of prisoners, in order to distress them to enlist in your infernal service, is not to be equalled by any instance in Europe."

The third and fourth pamphlets of "The Crisis" discuss all phases of the war; the ability of America to succeed if all the Colonies will unite in one grand effort for their independence. "Independence was a doctrine scarce and rare, even towards the conclusion of the year 1775; all our politics had been founded on the hope or expectation of making the matter up—a hope which though general on the side of America, had never entered the head or heart of the British Court. Their hope was conquest and confiscation. Good Heavens! what volumes of thanks does America owe to Britain? What infinite obligation to the tool that fills with

paradoxical vacancy, the throne! Nothing but the sharpest essence of villainy, could have produced a *menstruum* that would have effected a separation."

The Fifth "Crisis" is dedicated "To General Sir William Howe, in command of the English Army in America. There is not in the compass of language a sufficiency of words to express the baseness of your king, his ministry and his army. They have refined upon villainy till it wants a name. To the fierce vices of former ages they have added the dregs and scummings of the most finished rascality, and are so completely sunk in serpentine deceit, that there is not left among them *one* generous enemy.

"From such men and such masters may the gracious hand of Heaven preserve America! And though the sufferings she now endures are heavy and severe, they are like straws in the wind compared to the weight of evils she would feel under the government of your king, and his pensioned parliament.

"The time, sir, will come when you, in a melancholy hour, shall reckon up your miseries by your murders in America. Life, with you, begins to wear a clouded aspect. The vision of pleasurable delusion is wearing away, and changing to the barren wild of age and sorrow. The poor reflection of having served your king will yield you no consolation in your parting moments. He will crumble to the same undistinguished ashes with yourself, and have sins enough of his own to answer for. It is not the farcical benedictions of a bishop, nor the cringing hypocrisy of a court of chaplains, nor the formality of an act of parliament, that can change guilt into innocence or make the punishment *one* pang the less. You may, perhaps, be unwilling to be serious, but this destruction of the goods of Providence, this havoc of the human race, and this sowing the world with mischief, must be accounted for to Him who made and governs it. To us they are only present sufferings, but to Him they are deep rebellions.

"If there is a sin superior to every other, it is that of *willful* and *offensive war*. Most other sins are circumscribed

with narrow limits, that is, the power of *one* man cannot give them a very general extension, and many kinds of sins have only a mental existence from which no infection arises; but he who is the author of a war, lets loose the whole contagion of hell, and opens a vein that bleeds a nation to death. We leave it to England and Indians to boast of these honors; we feel no thirst for such savage glory; a nobler flame; a purer spirit animates America. She hath taken up the sword of virtuous defence; she hath bravely put herself between Tyranny and Freedom, between a curse and a blessing, determined to expel the one and protect the other."

Below I will copy Mr. Paine's "Address to Lord Howe," the bloody and cruel General Howe, who was in command of the British army in America, in order to illustrate the great versatility of talent of the author, as a writer, and to draw the attention of the reader to the peculiar aptitude of its composition to the vile object of his denunciation. But, in order to enable the reader to fully comprehend the fitness of the "Address," I will ask him to turn back a page or two, and again peruse what Mr. Paine says about Lord Howe in Nos. II and V of the "Crisis." I do not think I have ever read anything to compare with Paine's poetical "Address to Lord Howe." Its severe and merited satire; its indignant invective; its scathing denunciation of Lord Howe for the atrocities which he perpetrated on the Americans, and its vivid description of the sorrowful sufferings of those bereaved and defenceless people, has no parallel in the English language.

ADDRESS TO LORD HOWE

(Written at Philadelphia.)

The rain pours down, the city looks forlorn,
And gloomy subjects suit the howling morn;
Close by my fire, with door and window fast,
And safely shelter'd from the driving blast,
To gayer thoughts I bid a day's adieu,
To spend a scene of solitude with you.

So oft has black revenge engross'd the care
Of all the leisure hours man finds to spare;
So oft has guilt, in all her thousand dens,
Call'd for the vengeance of chastising pens,
That while I fein would ease my heart on you,
No thought is left untold, no passion new.

From flight to flight the mental path appears,
Worn with the steps of many thousand years,
And fill'd throughout with every scene of pain,
From George the murderer down to murderous Cain,
Alike in cruelty, alike in hate,
In guilt alike, but more alike in fate,
Cursed supremely for the blood they drew,
Each from the rising world, while each was new.

Go, man of blood! true likeness of the first,
And strew your blasted head with homely dust:
In ashes sit—in wretched sackcloth weep,
And with unpitied sorrows cease to sleep.
Go haunt the tombs, and single out the place,
Where earth itself shall suffer in disgrace.

Go spell the letters on some mouldering urn,
And ask if he who sleeps there can return;
Go count the numbers that in silence lie,
And learn by study what it is to die;
For sure your heart, if any heart you own,
Conceits that man expires without a groan;
That he who lives receives from you a grace,
Or death is nothing but a change of place:
That peace is dull, that joy from sorrow springs,
And war the most desirable of things.

Else why these scenes that wound the feeling mind,
This spot of death, this cockpit of mankind!
Why sobs the widow in perpetual pain?
Why cries the orphans?—"Oh! my father's slain!"
Why hangs the sire his paralytic head,
And nods with manly grief?—"My son is dead!"
Why drops the tear from off the sister's cheek,
And sweetly tells the pain that she would speak?
Or why, in sorrow sunk, does pensive John
To all the neighbors tell,"Poor master's gone!"

Oh! could I paint the passion that I feel,
Or point a horror that would wound like steel,
To thy unfeeling, unrelenting mind,
I'd send destruction and relieve mankind.
You that are husbands, fathers, brothers, all
The tender names which kindred learn to call;
Yet like an image carved in massy stone,
You bear the shape, but sentiment have none;
Allied by dust and figure, not with mind,
You only herd, but live not with mankind.

Since then no hopes to civilize remain,
And mild philosophy has preached in vain,
One prayer is left, which dreads no proud reply,
That he who made you breathe will make you die."

Thomas Jefferson said of Mr. Paine's writings: "No writer exceeded Paine in familiarity of style, in perspicuity of expression; happiness in elucidation, and in simple and unassuming language."

One of Paine's enemies criticised some of his writings, and spoke of him as a libeller to which he replied, in "Rights of Man" (page 37 of "Rickman's Life of Paine"): "If to expose the fraud and imposition of monarchy, and every species of hereditary government; to lessen the oppression; to prepare plans for education of helpless infancy, and the comfortable support of the aged and distressed; to endeavor to concilitate nations to each other; to extirpate the horrid practice of war; to promote universal peace, civilization and commerce; to break the chains of political superstition, and raise degraded man to his proper rank:—if these things are libelous, let me live the life of a libeller, and let the name of *Libeller* be engraven on my tomb."

His next pamphlet is addressed "To the inhabitants of America." He says: "With all the pleasure with which a man exchanges bad company for good, I take my leave of Sir William Howe, and return to you. It is now nearly three years since the tyranny of Britain received its first repulse by the arms of America. A period which has given birth to a new world, and erected a monument to the folly of the old.

"I cannot help being sometimes surprised at the complimentary references which I have seen and heard made to ancient histories and transactions. The wisdom, civil governments, and sense of honor of the states of Greece and Rome, are frequently held up as objects of excellence and imitation. Mankind have lived to very little purpose, if, at this period of the world, they must go two or three thousand years back for lessons and examples. We do great injustice to ourselves by placing them in such a superior line; we have no just authority for it, neither can we tell why it is that we should suppose ourselves inferior. Could the mist of antiquity be cleared away, and men and things be viewed as they really are, it is more than probable that they would admire us, rather than we them. America has surmounted a greater variety and combination of difficulties, than, I believe, ever fell to the share of any one people, in the same space of time, and has replenished the world with more useful knowledge and sounder maxims of civil government than were ever produced in any age before. Had it not been for America, there had been no such thing as freedom left throughout the whole universe. England hath lost hers in a long chain of right reasoning from wrong principles, and it is from this country, now, that she must learn the resolution to redress herself, and the wisdom how to accomplish it.

"The Grecians and Romans were strongly possessed of the *spirit* of liberty but *not the principle*, for at the time that they were determined not to be slaves themselves, they employed their power to enslave the rest of mankind. But this distinguished era is blotted by no one misanthropical vice.

"In short, if the principle on which the cause is founded, the universal blessings that are to arise from it, the difficulties that accompanied it, the wisdom with which it has been debated, the fortitude by which it has been supported, the strength of the power which we had to oppose, and the condition in which we undertook it, be all taken in one view, we may justly style it the most virtuous and illustrious revolution that ever graced the history of mankind.

"A good opinion of ourselves is exceedingly necessary in private life, but absolutely necessary in public life, and of the utmost importance in supporting national character. I have no notion of yielding the palm of the United States to any Grecians or Romans that were ever born. We have equalled the bravest in times of danger, and excelled the wisest in the construction of civil governments.

"The only way to finish a war with the least possible bloodshed, or perhaps without any, is to collect an army, against the power of which, the enemy shall have no chance. By not doing this, we prolong the war, and double both the calamities and the expenses of it. What a rich and happy country would America be, were she, by a vigorous exertion, to reduce Howe as she has reduced Burgoyne. Her currency would rise to millions beyond its present value. Every man would be rich, and every man would have it in his power to be happy. And why not do these things? What is there to hinder?"

His Sixth "Crisis" is directed "To the Earl of Carlisle, General Clinton and William Eden, Esq., British Commissioners at New York." They were sent over to make some kind of a rascally peace with the Americans. Paine commences as follows: "There is a dignity in the warm passions of a Whig, which is never to be found in the cold malice of a Tory. In the one, nature is only heated—in the other she is poisoned. The instant the former has it in his power to punish, he feels a disposition to forgive, but the canine venom of the latter knows no relief but revenge. This general distinction will, I believe, apply in all cases, and suit as well the meridian of England as America.

"Like men in a state of intoxication, you forget that the rest of the world have eyes, and that the same stupidity which conceals you from yourselves exposes you to their satire and contempt.

"We are invited to submit to a man who has attempted by every cruelty to destroy us, and to join him in making war against France, who is already against him for our support.

"Can Bedlam, in concert with Lucifer, form a more mad and devilish request? Were it possible a people could sink into such apostacy they would deserve to be swept from the earth like the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah. The proposition is an universal affront to the rank which man holds in the creation, and an indignity to Him who placed him there. It supposes him made up without a spark of honor, and under no obligation to God or man.

"What sort of men or Christians must you suppose the Americans to be, who, after seeing their most humble petitions insultingly rejected—the most grievous laws passed to distress them in every quarter—an undeclared war let loose upon them, and Indians and Negroes invited to the slaughter—who, after seeing their kinsmen murdered, their fellow-citizens starved to death in prisons, and their houses and property destroyed and burned,—who, after the most serious appeals to heaven, the most solemn abjuration by oath of all government connected with you, and the most heart-felt pledges and protestation of faith to each other—and who, after soliciting the friendship, and entering into alliances with other nations, should at last break through all these obligations, civil and divine, by complying with your horrid and infernal proposal?

"You may plan and execute little mischiefs, but are they worth the expense they cost you, or will such partial evils have any effect on the general cause? Your expedition to Egg Harbor, will be felt at a distance like an attack upon a hen-roost, and expose you in Europe, with a sort of childish frenzy. Is it worth while to keep an army to protect you in writing proclamations, or to get once a year into winter-quarters?"

His Seventh "Crisis" is addressed "To the people of England." He fully discusses the futility of their trying to conquer America, and gives many reasons for it. He cites many instances of detriment to their interest by continuing the war (pages 188 and 189): "War never can be the interest of a trading nation, any more than quarreling can be profitable to a man in business. But to make war with

those who trade with us, is like setting a bull-dog upon a customer at the shop-door. The least degree of common sense shows the madness of the latter, and it will apply with the same force of conviction to the former.

"In whatever light the war with America is considered upon commercial principles, it is evidently the interest of the people of England not to support it; and why it has been supported so long, against the clearest demonstrations of truth, and national advantage, is to me, and must be to all the reasonable world, a matter of astonishment."

His Eighth "Crisis" is likewise addressed "To the people of England." He very fully discusses the speech of the King of England. It commences as follows:

" 'Trusting (says the King of England in his speech of November last) in the divine Providence, and in the justice of my cause, I am firmly resolved to prosecute the war with vigor, and to make every exertion in order to compel our enemies to equitable terms of peace and accommodation.' To this declaration the United States of America, and the confederated powers of Europe will reply, if Britain will have war, she shall have enough of it.

"Five years have nearly elapsed since the commencement of hostilities, and every campaign, by a gradual decay, has lessened your ability to conquer, without producing a serious thought on your condition or your fate. Like a prodigal lingering in an habitual consumption, you feel the relics of life, and mistake them for recovery. New schemes, like new medicines, have administered fresh hopes, and prolonged the disease instead of curing it. A change of generals, like a change of physicians, served only to keep the flattery alive, and furnish new pretences for new extravagance.

"This makes the second paper, addressed perhaps in vain, to the people of England. That advice should be taken wherever example has failed, or precept be regarded where warning is ridiculed, is like a picture of hope resting on despair; but when time shall stamp with universal currency, the facts you have long encountered with a laugh, and the irresistible evidence of accumulated losses like the hand-

writing on the wall, shall add terror to distress, you will then, in a conflict of sufferings, learn to sympathize with others by feeling for yourselves.

"Hitherto you have experienced the expenses, but nothing of the miseries of war. Your disappointments have been accompanied with no immediate suffering, and your losses came to you only by intelligence. Like fire at a distance, your heard not even the cry; you felt not the danger, you saw not the confusion. To you everything has been foreign but the taxes to support it. You knew not what it was to be alarmed at midnight with an armed enemy in the streets. You were strangers to the distressing scene of a family in flight, and to the thousand restless cares and tender sorrows that incessantly arose. To see women and children wandering in the severity of winter, with the broken remains of a well-furnished house, and seeking shelter in every crib and hut, were matters you had no conception of. You knew not what it was to stand by and see your goods chopped for fuel, and your beds ripped to pieces to make packages for plunder. The misery of others, like a tempestuous night, added to the pleasures of your own security."

He commences his Ninth "Crisis" as follows: "Had America pursued her advantages with half the spirit that she resisted her misfortunes, she would, before now, have been a conquering and a peaceful people; but lulled in the lap of soft tranquillity, she rested on her hopes, and adversity only has convulsed her into action. Whether subtlety or insincerity, at the close of the last year, induced the enemy to an appearance for peace, is a point not material to know; it is sufficient that we see the effects it has had on our politics, and that we sternly rise to resent the delusion.

"At a crisis, big, like the present, with expectation and events, the whole country is called to unanimity and exertion. Not an ability ought now to sleep that can produce but a mite to the general good, nor even a whisper to pass that militates against it. The necessity of the case and the importance of the consequences, admit no delay from a friend—no apology from an enemy. To spare now, would

be the height of extravagance, and to consult present ease, would be to sacrifice it, perhaps forever."

In his Tenth "Crisis" he writes "On the Subject of Taxation," and very fully discusses it in all of its bearings. He takes up the enormous cost of the war to England, and compares it to the small cost to America, in which he employs a large number of figures to elucidate the comparison. He then discusses how the money can be raised by the Americans for carrying on the war, and how it should be proportioned among the Colonies, showing that it would not be burdensome to any one of them.

His Eleventh "Crisis" is "On the King of England's Speech." He says: "Although the situation of America, superior to every effort to enslave her, and daily rising to importance and opulence, hath placed herself above the region of anxiety, it has still left her within the circle of curiosity; and her fancy to see the speech of a man who had proudly threatened to bring her to his feet, was visibly marked with that tranquil confidence which cared nothing about its contents. It was inquired after with a smile, read with a laugh, and dismissed with disdain.

"How easy it is to abuse truth and language, when men, by habitual wickedness, have learned to set justice at defiance. That the very man who began the war, who with the most sullen insolence refused to answer, and even to hear the humblest of all petitions; who hath encouraged his officers and his army in the most savage cruelties, and the most scandalous plunderings, who hath stirred up the Indians on one side, and the Negroes on the other, and invoked every aid of hell in his behalf, should now, with an affected air of pity, turn the tables from himself, and charge to another the wickedness that is his own, can only be equalled by the baseness of the heart that spoke it.

"TO BE NOBLY WRONG IS MORE MANLY THAN TO BE MEANLY RIGHT," is an expression I once used on a former occasion, and it is equally applicable now. We feel something like respect for consistency even in error. We lament the virtue that is debauched into vice, but the

vice that affects a virtue becomes the more detestable; and amongst the various assumptions of character which hypocrisy has taught and men have practiced, there is none that raises a higher relish of disgust, than to see disappointed inveteracy twisting itself, by the most visible falsehoods, into an appearance of piety it has not pretensions to."

He then discusses the sufferings of the past as follows: "What are the little sufferings of the present day, compared with the hardships that are past. There was a time, when we had neither house nor home in safety; when every hour was the hour of alarm and danger; when the mind, tortured with anxiety, knew no repose, and every thing but hope and fortitude, was bidding us farewell."

His Fifteenth "Crisis" is very beautiful and very cheering to the Americans, as their independence had been about achieved. It was written on April 19th, 1783, and begins as follows: "The times that tried men's souls, are over, and the greatest and completest revolution the world ever knew, is gloriously and happily accomplished.

"But to pass from the extremes of danger to safety—from the tumult of war to the tranquillity of peace, though sweet in contemplation, requires a gradual composure of the senses to receive it. Even calmness has the power of stunning, when it opens too instantly upon us. The long and raging hurricane that should cease in a moment, would leave us in a state rather of wonder than enjoyment; and some moments of recollection must pass, before we could be capable of tasting the felicity of repose. There are but few instances, in which the mind is fitted for sudden transitions: it takes in its pleasures by reflection and comparison, and those must have time to act, before the relish for new scenes is complete.

"In the present case, the mighty magnitude of the object, the various uncertainties of fate it has undergone, the numerous and complicated dangers we have suffered or escaped, the eminence we now stand on, and the vast prospect before us, must all conspire to impress us with contemplation.

"To see it in our power to make a world happy, to teach mankind the art of being so, to exhibit, on the theatre of the universe, a character hitherto unknown, and to have, as it were, a new creation intrusted to our hands, are honors that command reflection, and can neither be too highly estimated, nor too gratefully received.

"In this pause then of recollection—while the storm is ceasing, and the long agitated mind vibrating to a rest; let us look back on the scenes we have passed, and learn from experience what is yet to be done.

"Never, I say, had a country so many openings to happiness as this. Her setting out in life, like the rising of a fair morning, was unclouded and promising. Her cause was good. Her principles just and liberal. Her temper serene and firm. Her conduct regulated by the nicest steps, and every thing about her wore the mark of honor. It is not every country (perhaps there is not another in the world) that can boast so fair an origin. Even the first settlement of America corresponds with the character of the Revolution. Rome, once the proud mistress of the universe, was originally a band of ruffians. Plunder and rapine made her rich, and her oppression of millions made her great. But America need never be ashamed to tell her birth, nor relate the stages by which she rose to empire.

"The remembrance, then, of what is past, if it operates rightly, must inspire her with the most laudable of all ambition, that of adding to the fair fame she began with. The world has seen her great in adversity. Struggling, without a thought of yielding, beneath accumulated difficulties. Bravely, nay proudly, encountering distress, and rising in resolution as the storm increased. All this is justly due to her, for her fortitude has merited the character. Let then, the world see that she can bear prosperity; and that her honest virtue in time of peace, is equal to the bravest virtue in time of war.

"Character is much easier kept than recovered, and that man, if any such there be, who, from sinister views, or little-

ness of soul, lends unseen his hand, to injure it, contrives a wound it will never be in his power to heal.

"If in the course of more than seven years, I have rendered her any service, I have likewise added something to the reputation of literature by freely and disinterestedly employing it in the great cause of mankind, and showing that there may be genius without prostitution.

"Independence always appeared to me practicable and probable, provided the sentiment of the country could be formed and held to the object, and there is no instance in the world where a people so extended, and wedded to former habits of thinking, and under such a variety of circumstances were so instantly and effectually pervaded by a turn in politics, as in the case of independence, and who supported their opinion, undiminished, through such a succession of good and ill fortune, till they crowned it with success.

"But as the scenes of war are closed, and every man preparing for home and happier times, I therefore take my leave of the subject. I have most sincerely followed it from beginning to end, and through all its turns and windings: and whatever country I may hereafter be in, I shall always feel an honest pride at the part I have taken and acted, and a gratitude to Nature and Providence for putting it in my power to be of some use to mankind."

His Sixteenth and last "Crisis" is addressed "To the People of America." He warns the Americans to beware of the hypocrisy and wiles of England in relation to commercial intercourse between the two countries. He impresses it upon them that all the States should stand loyally together:

"But it is only by acting in union, that the usurpations of foreign nations on the freedom of trade can be counteracted, and security extended to the commerce of America. And when we view a flag, which to the eye is beautiful, and to contemplate its rise and origin inspires a sensation of sublime delight, our national honor must unite with our interests to prevent injury to the one, or insult to the other." (Page 300.)

poetical liberties he has taken of omitting some facts, distorting others, and making the machinery bend to produce a stage effect. Of this kind is his account of the expedition to Versailles. He begins this account by omitting the only facts which, as causes, are known to be true; everything beyond these is conjecture, even in Paris, and he then works up a tale accommodated to his own passions and prejudices."

Mr. Burke was the ablest speaker and writer in the English Parliament. At one time he was a strong advocate of political freedom, and was a staunch friend of the American Colonies. Afterwards he changed his tactics, which Paine attributed to undue influence over him by the English Government, in the way of giving him and his wife a pension for life, which was not generally known, but it was unearthed by Paine. I have copied rather freely from the writings of Mr. Paine, in order to show my readers "what manner of man" he was; and also to enable them to compare the writings of Junius with those of Paine, both of whom I regard as the same person.

Inasmuch as "Preparedness" is the all-absorbing topic of discussion both in and out of Congress, at the present time (March, 1916), I will recite parts of what Thomas Paine said on this and kindred subjects, over one hundred years ago. In the first place, he was a great advocate of having a Peace Congress, for the arbitration of all differences between nation and nation. On this subject he said: "It is attributed to Henry IV of France, a man of enlarged and benevolent heart, that he proposed about 1610, a plan of abolishing war in Europe. The plan consisted in constituting an European Congress, or, as the French authors would style it, a Pacific Republic, by appointing delegates from the several nations, who were to act as a Court of Arbitration in any dispute that might arise between nation and nation." See page 132, "Political and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine." On page 267 he further says: "It is, I think, quite certain, that if the fleets of England, France, and Holland were confederated, they could propose, with effect, a limi-

tation to, and a general dismantling of, all the navies in Europe, to a certain proportion to be agreed upon.

"First, that no new ship of war shall be built by any power in Europe, themselves included.

"Secondly, that all the navies now in existence shall be put back, suppose to one tenth of their present force. This will save to France and England at least two millions annually to each, and their relative force be in the same proportion as it is now. If men will permit themselves to think, as rational beings ought to think, nothing can appear more ridiculous and absurd, exclusive of all moral reflections, than to be at the expense of building navies, filling them with men, and then hauling them into the ocean, to try which can sink each other fastest. Peace, which costs nothing, is attended with infinitely more advantage than any victory with all its expense. But this, though it best answers the purpose of nations, does not that of Court Governments, whose habitual policy is pretence for taxation, places, and offices." On page 267 he says: "A gun-boat, carrying heavy metal, is a movable fortification, and there is no mode or system of defense the United States can go into for coasts and harbors or ports, that will be so effectual as by gun-boats.

"Ships of the line are no ways fitted for the defense of a coast. They are too bulky to act in narrow waters, and cannot act at all in shoal waters. Like a whale, they must be in deep waters, and at a distance from land." He says, besides: "Gun-boats can be built for one-fiftieth part of the cost of gun-ships."

I have only quoted short extracts from the above productions, which are quite lengthy. ("Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine.")

I coincide with Mr. Paine in his wise suggestions, with some modifications to harmonize with the many developments in Militarism, since he wrote, over one hundred years ago: In his proposition to inaugurate a Peace Congress of all enlightened nations to arbitrate material differences

between nation and nation; but I would suggest that a provision be made in the compact to compel any refractory nation to abide by the decision of the Arbitration Board, and in order to enforce its decision, that all of the other nations in the Peace Congress should obligate themselves to contribute their *pro rata* share in money, ships and men, according to the population of each, in order to enforce the decision of the Board against any of the nations refusing to obey the same.

As to his suggestion for defending our sea coasts against the incursions of an enemy, by using gun-boats instead of battle-ships, I think it was very wise at the time, for the reasons stated by him; but, as the submarine has been invented since that time, I will venture to suggest that, instead of increasing the number of our battle-ships, we should build and equip a reasonable number of submarines to be scattered along our entire coast, at important points, which, with our present navy, would be sufficient to repel the attacks of any nation or nations which might have the temerity to make war upon us. I do not coincide with our authorities that it is necessary or wise to expend the immense amount of money suggested in building a very much greater number of battle-ships than we already have. This course of procedure might have had some plausibility in it ten years ago, when almost every nation was "armed to the teeth" and flushed with money, and could have given us very considerable trouble, if they had been so disposed. But owing to the gigantic war now pending between all of the most powerful nations of Europe, they have become already, so very much depleted in their financial matters, as well as in men for their armies, and in all other material resources, that they will be almost impotent to wage a war against the United States which will be in admirable plight to resist any attacks which might be made against us; especially if our land forces were augmented by each State increasing its militia and putting them in training, so they would be ready for any emergency which might arise. In my opinion, all those nations which are now at

war with each other, including those which may be drawn into the conflict, will have all they can possibly do to defend themselves at home for the next fifty years, and will have no time or inclination to "pick a fuss" with us.

In addition to the foregoing preparation for defence, we could mine our principal harbors, if necessary, and build a reasonable number of war-planes, which would put us in a state of perfect "Preparedness." I am curious to know what will be thought of the above suggestions twenty-five years hence.

We could implicitly rely upon the patriotism and valor of our people to volunteer, if necessary, if ever we have a "Call to arms" for the defense of our beloved country, without maintaining a large and very expensive standing army.

Having copied a number of the writings of Junius and of Paine, I will invite my readers to make a comparison of the styles of their compositions, which I think they will conclude are very similar to each other: in fact, identical. *Style* in writing, is an inherent peculiarity in each prominent author, and is almost as easily recognized as the features of his face. Take, for instance, the poems and letters of Burns, Byron and Moore, and the novels of Dickens, Scott and Thackeray, and you will find no similarity among them. Each has his own individuality. Then compare the writings of Junius and Paine, and you will perceive the same identical features of style in both. In the first place, both are singularly epigrammatic, with well-rounded periods. The sentences are mostly of uniform length, very euphonious and rhythmic in their sound, to the reader. Their facts are concisely grouped together, their arguments are logical. Their antitheses are frequent. Their comparisons are lucid. Their syllogisms are perfectly formed. Their sarcasms are keen. Their irony is bitter. Their ridicule is overpowering. Their metaphors are brilliant; and they have the same propensity for putting searching interrogations to their adversaries. Both are fearless, aggressive and courageous writers. All of these kindred features in their styles of writing, go to

prove that the authors were one and the same person. Furthermore, style may be said to be the garments with which we clothe our ideas, or thoughts, as we give utterance to them. There are as many different styles of composition, as styles in dressing. Many authors are as easily detected in their style of writing, as in their style of dressing. Therefore, we may say that a fine style of composition is the production of an *expert* literary *tailor*; and a *poor* style is made by a "botch." Peculiarities of style originate in the mind, and are nature's work. Consequently, when the same person gives utterance to ideas and thoughts on two different subjects, similar in their nature, he uses similar modes of expression, which are easily recognized by the structure of his sentences. So it is with the author of the "Junius Letters" and the author of "Common Sense." Their subjects were of a closely kindred nature, and many of the facts and circumstances were of a similar character. Consequently, the arguments used on both subjects were more or less alike. As they resemble each other so very closely, I conclude that they were written by the same identical author. I have before said, the *facts* going to prove the identity of Junius are very few, he being wholly unknown, therefore, we must resort to pertinent, logical arguments, in addition to surrounding circumstances, such as style, friendships and animosities, kindred subjects, their aims and objects. No doubt Paine avoided using any quotations from, or sentences similar to, any in the Junius Letters, because he well knew that if he did, he would at once be spotted as Junius, by the officers of the English army, then in America, or by the English police force then in nearly all the American cities. Junius, in one of his letters said that the English Government had at that time, spent over 6,000 pounds trying to apprehend him; so that had he been found out in America, he would have been arrested and sent to England, where he would have been severely punished, and probably been confined in the London Tower indefinitely.

The style of Paine in his "Common Sense" and his "Crisis" pamphlets is identical with that of the Junius

Letters, and was written on almost precisely the same subjects. He was against the English monarchical form of Government, its venal Ministry, and its corrupt Parliament, which were then doing all in their power to oppress and enslave the American Colonies, through their army and navy; murdering the people, and laying waste the country, towns and cities of America.

After Independence was won, and a firm and glorious Government had been established by the "United States of America," there was concocted a very formidable and insidious party, known as "The Federal Party," with John Adams advocating an Hereditary Monarchy, similar to that of Great Britain, and Alexander Hamilton advocating a Senate for life, besides, a large number of very influential men working along the same lines (see pp. 226, 227, etc., of Paine's "Political and Miscellaneous Works"), which party, and its policies, Paine fought most vigorously. He further says: "John Jay has said that the Senate should have been appointed for life. He would then have been sure of never wanting a lucrative appointment for himself, and have had no fears about impeachment. These [Jay, Adams and Hamilton] are the disguised traitors that call themselves Federalists. If Mr. Jay desires to know on what authority I say this, I will give that authority publicly when he chooses to call for it. ("Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine," p. 159.)

After his return from France, Mr. Paine wrote ten letters to "The Citizens of the United States," commencing on page 211, in the "Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine." His object was to warn them against the wiles of the Federal Party, and for defeating the Federalists, headed by John Adams and Alexander Hamilton, in their wicked attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States, and establish a Limited Monarchy in its stead, in which he succeeded, with the help of other loyal patriots.

These powerful letters very much resemble the Junius Letters. On page 218 he says of ex-President Adams:

"John Adams is a man of paradoxical heresies, and consequently of a bewildered mind. He wrote a book entitled 'A Defense of the American Constitutions,' and the principles of it are an attack upon them. But the book is descended to the tomb of forgetfulness, and the best fortune that can attend its author is quietly to follow its fate. John was not born for immortality. But, to return to Federalism.

"I have had doubts of John Adams ever since the year 1776. In a conversation with me at that time, concerning the pamphlet 'Common Sense,' he censured it because it attacked the English form of government. John was for independence because he expected to be made great by it; but it was not difficult to perceive, for the surliness of his temper makes him an awkward hypocrite, that his head was full of kings, queens, and knaves, as a pack of cards. But John has lost deal. Knowing as I do, the consummate vanity of John Adams, and the shallowness of his judgment, I can easily picture to myself that when he arrived at the Federal city, he was strutting in the pomp of his imagination before the Presidential house, or in the audience hall, and exulting in the language of Nebuchadnezzar: 'Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the honor of my majesty.' But in that unfortunate hour, or soon after, John, like Nebuchadnezzar, was driven from among men, and fled with the speed of a post-horse.

"But to return to federalism and apostacy. The plan of the leaders of the faction was to overthrow the liberties of the new world, and place government on the corrupt system of the old. They wanted to hold their power by a more lasting tenure than the choice of their constituents. It is impossible to account for their conduct and the measures they adopted on any other ground. But to accomplish that object, a standing army and a prodigal revenue must be raised; and to obtain these, pretenses must be invented to deceive. Alarms of dangers that did not exist even in imagination, but in the direct spirit of lying, were spread abroad. Apostacy stalked through the land in the garb of

patriotism, and the torch of treason blinded for a while the flame of liberty.

"To elect and to reject, is the prerogative of a free people. Since the establishment of independence, no period has arrived that so decidedly proves the excellence of the representative system of government, and its superiority over every other, as the time we now live in. Had America been cursed with John Adams's *hereditary monarchy*, or Alexander Hamilton's *senate for life*, she must have sought, in the doubtful contest of civil war, what she now obtains by the expression of public will. An appeal to elections decides better than an appeal to the sword.

"The reign of terror that raged in America during the latter end of the Washington administration, and the whole of that of Adams, is enveloped in mystery to me. That there were men in the government hostile to the representative system, though it is now their overthrow, was once their boast, and therefore the fact is established against them.

"The object therefore, must be something at home, and that something was the overthrow of the representative system of government, for it could be nothing else. But the plotters got into confusion and became enemies to each other. Adams hated and was jealous of Hamilton, and Hamilton hated and despised both Adams and Washington."

Mr. Paine wrote a large number of other literary and scientific articles and letters, embracing two or three hundred pages, which are too numerous to mention.

As to the handwriting of Mr. Paine, I have not been able to get hold of any, to compare with that of Junius. As Paine wrote his "Common Sense" and some of the "Crisis," by camp-fire at night, it is very reasonable to suppose that he wrote with a pencil, for convenience, and that he had his letters copied in ink, before they went to the press, in order to make them more intelligible to the printer, by eliminating interlineations, etc. It therefore follows that if there was any difference in the handwriting of the *ink* copy of Paine's letters, and the handwriting of the Junius Letters, these circumstances would readily account for it.

It is a well-known fact that every distinguished author has his peculiar animosities and friendships, which naturally crop out on every occasion. Take for example the two characters which are now under discussion. Francis was a fast and intimate friend of Lord Clive, who was for a long time Governor of India; sent there by the English Government, and who built up a very unsavory reputation and an immense fortune; and was recalled, to which, I will refer more particularly hereafter. Francis frequently visited Lord Clive, at his country place, Walcot, England, where he seems to have had the "time of his life," as appears from one of his letters to his wife. If Francis had been Junius he would hardly have been so intimate with any man of such a detestable character as Lord Clive, because Junius was always eager to lampoon any person connected with the English Government; so was Paine, who wrote one of the most severe and caustic essays I ever read, on the character of Lord Clive, which I will here introduce:

LIFE AND DEATH OF LORD CLIVE

"Ah! The tale is told—the scene is ended—and the curtain falls. As an emblem of the vanity of all earthly pomp, let his monument be a globe, but be that globe a bubble; let his effigy be a man walking round in his sleep; and let Fame, in the character of a shadow, inscribe his honors on the air.

"I view him but as yesterday on the burning plains of Plassey, doubtful of life, health or victory. I see him in the instant when 'To be or not to be' were equal chances to a human eye—to be a Lord or a slave, to return loaded with the spoils, or remain mingled with the dust of India.

"Did necessity always justify the severity of a conqueror the rude tongue of censure would be silent, and however painfully he might look back on scenes of horror, the pensive reflection would not alarm him. Though his feelings suffered, his conscience would be acquitted. The sad remembrance would move serenely and leave the mind without a wound.

"But O India! thou loud proclaimer of European cruelties! thou bloody monument of unnecessary deaths! be tender in the days of inquiry, and show a Christian world thou canst suffer and forgive.

"Departed from India, and loaded with plunder, I see him doubling the Cape and looking wistfully to Europe. I see him contemplating on years of pleasure, and gratifying his ambition with expected honors. I see his arrival pompously announced in every newspaper, his eager eye rambling through the crowd in quest of homage, and his ear listening lest an applause should escape him. Happily for him he arrived before his *fame*, and the short interval was a time of rest. From the crowd I follow him to Court, I see him enveloped in the sunshine of sovereign favor, rivaling the great in honors, the proud in splendor, and the rich in wealth.

"From the court I trace him to the country; his equipage moves like a camp: every village bell proclaims his coming, the wondering peasants admire his pomp, and his heart runs over with joy.

"But alas! (not satisfied with unaccountable thousands) I accompany him again to India. I mark the variety of countenances which appear at his landing—confusion spreads the news—every passion seems alarmed—the wailing widow, the crying orphan, and the childless parent remember and lament; the rival Nabobs court his favor; the rich dread his power, and the poor his severity. Fear and terror march like pioneers before his camp—murder and rapine accompany it—famine and wretchedness follow it in the rear.

"Resolved on accumulating an unbounded fortune, he enters into all the schemes of war, treaty and intrigue. The British sword is set up for sale; the heads of contending Nabobs are offered at a price, and the bribe taken from both sides. Thousands of men or money are trifles in an Indian bargain. The field is an empire, and the treasure almost without end. The wretched inhabitants are glad to compound for offences never committed, and to purchase at any rate the privilege to breathe; while he, the *sole* lord of

their lives and fortunes, disposes of either as he pleases, and prepares for Europe.

"Uncommon fortunes require an uncommon date of life to enjoy them. The usual period is spent in preparing to live; and unless nature prolongs the time, fortune bestows her excess of favors in vain.

"The Conqueror of the East having nothing more to expect from the one, has all his court to make to the other. Anxiety for wealth gives place to anxiety for life; and wisely recollecting that the sea is no respecter of persons, resolves on taking his route to Europe by land. Little beings move unseen, or unobserved, but he engrosses whole kingdoms in his march, and is gazed at like a comet. The burning desert, the pathless mountains, and the fertile valleys, are in their turns explored and passed over. No material accident distresses his progress, and England once more receives the spoiler.

"How sweet is rest to the weary traveler; the retrospect heightens the enjoyment; and if the future prospect be serene the days of ease and happiness are arrived. An uninquiring observer might have been inclined to consider Lord Clive, under all these agreeable circumstances, one whose every care was over, and who had nothing to do but sit down and say: 'Soul take thine ease, thou hast goods laid up in store for many years.'

"The reception which he met with on his second arrival, was in every instance equal, and in many, exceeded, the honors of the first. It is the peculiar temper of the English to applaud before they think. Generous of their praise, they frequently bestow it unworthily; but when once the truth arrives, the torrent stops, and rushes back again with the same violence. Scarcely had the echo of applause ceased upon the ear, than the rude tongue of censure took up the tale. The newspapers, fatal enemies to ill-gotten wealth, began to buzz a general suspicion of his conduct, and the inquisitive public soon refined it into particulars. Every post gave a stab to his fame—a wound to his peace—and a nail to his coffin. Like spectres from the grave, they haunt-

ed him in every company, and whispered murder in his ear. A life checkered with uncommon varieties is seldom a long one. Action and care will in time wear down the strongest frame, but guilt and melancholy are poisons of quick dispatch.

"Say, cool deliberate reflection, was the prize, though abstracted from the guilt, worthy of the pains? Ah! no. Fatigued with victory, he sat down to rest, and while he was recovering breath, he lost it. A conqueror more fatal than himself beset him, and revenged the injuries done to India.

"As a cure for avarice and ambition let us take a view of him in his latter years. Ha! what gloomy being wanders yonder? How visibly is the melancholy heart delineated on his countenance. He mourns no common care—his very steps are timed to sorrow—he trembles with a kind of mental palsy. Perhaps it is some broken-hearted parent, some David mourning for his son Absalom, or some Heraclitus weeping for the world. I hear him utter something about wealth—perhaps he is poor, and hath not wherewithal to hide his head. Some debtor started from his sleepless pillow, to ruminate on poverty and ponder on the horrors of a jail. Poor man! I'll to him and relieve him. Ha! 'tis Lord Clive himself! Bless me, what a change! He makes, I see, for yonder cypress shade, a fit scene for melancholy hearts! I'll watch him there and listen to his story. Lord Clive soliloquizes: 'Can I but suffer when a beggar pities me? Ere while I heard a ragged wretch, who every mark of poverty had on, say to a sooty sweep, "Ah, poor Lord Clive!" while he, the negro colored vagrant, more mercifully cruel, curst me in my hearing. There was a time when fortune, like a yielding mistress, courted me with smiles—she never waited to be told my wishes, but studied to discover them, and seemed not happy to herself, but when she had some favor to bestow. Ah! little did I think the fair enchantress would desert me thus; and after lavishing her smiles upon me, turn my reproacher, and publish me in folio to the world. Volumes of morality are dull and spiritless compared to me. Lord Clive is himself a treatise upon vanity,

printed upon a golden type. The most unlettered clown writes explanatory notes thereon, and reads them to his children. Yet I could bear these insults could I but bear myself. A strange unwelcome something hangs about me. In company I seem no company at all. The festive board appears to me a stage, the crimson colored port resembles blood—each glass is strangely metamorphosed into a man in armor, and every bowl appears a Nabob. The joyous toast is like the sound of murder, and the loud laughs are the groans of dying men. The scenes of India are all rehearsed, and no one sees the tragedy but myself. Ah! I discover things which are not, and hear unuttered sounds.

'O peace, thou sweet companion of the calm and innocent, whither art thou fled? here take my gold, and all the world calls mine, and come thou in exchange. O thou, thou noisy sweep, who mixeth thy food with the soot and relishes it, who canst descend from lofty heights and walk the humbler earth again, without repining at the change, come teach thy mystery to me. Or thou, thou ragged wandering beggar, who, when thou canst not beg successfully, will pilfer from the hound, and eat the dirty morsel sweetly; be thou Lord Clive, and I will beg, so that I may laugh like thee.

'Could I unlearn what I've already learned—unact what I've already acted—or would some sacred power convey me back to youth and innocence, I'd act another part—I'd keep within the pale of humble life, nor wish for that the world calls pomp.

> But since this cannot be,
> And only a few days and sad, remain for me,
> I'll haste to quit the scene, for what is life,
> When every passion of the soul's at strife?' "
>
> —(Atlanticus.)

The English language contains nothing that can compare with the foregoing essay. Now, if Paine were Junius, the above article is in perfect harmony with all his political writings, and was in unison with his desire to break down

the English Government. And, although he did not sign the name of "Common Sense" or any other of his fictitious names, to it, he may have had a motive for not doing so. He may have desired to create the impression that there were other writers who were criticising the Government.

In April, 1773, a Committee of the House of Commons, under the name of the Select Committee, were appointed by the House to enquire into the East India affairs, and the conduct of the several Governors of Bengal. The Committee having gone through the examination, Gen. Burgoyne, the chairman, prefaced their report to the House, informing them, "That the reports contained accounts shocking to human nature, that the most infamous designs had been carried into execution by perfidy and murder." He recapitulated the wretched situation of the East Indian Princes, who held their dignities on the precarious condition of being the highest bribers. "No claim, however just on their part," he said, "could be admitted without being introduced with enormous sums of rupees, nor any prince suffered to reign long, who did not quadrate with this idea; and that Lord Clive, over and above the enormous sums he might with some appearance of justice lay claim to, had obtained others to which he could have no title." He (General Burgoyne) therefore moved, "That it appears to this House, that Robert Lord Clive, baron of Plassey, about the time of deposing Surajah Dowla, Nabob of Bengal, and establishing Meer Jeffier in his room, did, through the influence of the power with which he was intrusted, as member of the *Select Committee* in India, and *Commander-in-chief of the British forces* there, obtain and possess himself of two lacks and 80,000 rupees, as Commander-in-chief; a further sum of 16 lacks of rupees, or more, under the denomination of *private donations*; which sums, amounting together to 20 lacks and 80,000 rupees, were of the value, in English money, of 234,000 pounds, and that in so doing, the said Robert Lord Clive abused the powers with which he was intrusted, to the evil example of the servants of the public." He was dismissed from the service of the Government.

Whenever Mr. Paine discovered fraud or dishonesty, he did not hestitate to expose it, although it was to his detriment. In February 1781, the United States sent the well-known Silas Deane to France, to procure a loan from the Government, to carry on the war with England; in which, he was assisted by Dr. Franklin. Afterwards, Col. Laurens, of S. C., and Mr. Paine, were sent to aid in the solicitation of the loan. They applied to King Louis XVI on the subject, and succeeded in getting $2,500,000 in silver, and a large amount of army stores, which the King donated to the United States, which were shipped and consigned to Silas Deane and one Beaumarchais, in order to conceal the facts from Great Britain, as requested by Louis XVI, as it was somewhat of a secret. Sometime afterwards, Silas Deane presented a claim to Congress for payment of the stores, which he said were *purchased* by him and Beaumarchais from the King, which in fact, were taken from the French Arsenal, and presented to the United States.

On pages 461, 462, and 463 of the "Poetical and Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Paine," he explains the transaction; he says: "When I was appointed Secretary to the Committee for Foreign Affairs, all the papers of the Secret Committee, none of which had been seen by Congress, came into my hands. I saw by the correspondence of that Committee with persons in Europe, particularly with Arthur Lee, that the stores which Deane and Beaumarchais pretended they had purchased, were a present from the Court of France and came out of the King's arsenals. Knowing these things, and seeing that the public were deceived and imposed upon by the pretensions of Deane, I took the subject up, and published three pieces in Dunlap's Philadelphia paper, headed with the title of 'Common Sense to the Public on Mr. Deane's Affairs." John Jay was then President of Congress.

"After the third piece appeared, I received an order, dated Congress, and signed John Jay, that 'Thomas Paine do attend at the bar of this house immediately,' which I did. Mr. Jay took up a newspaper and said: 'Here is Mr. Dunlap's paper of December 29th. In it is a piece entitled

"Common Sense to the Public on Mr. Deane's Affairs;" I am directed by Congress to ask you if you are the author.' 'Yes, sir, I am the author of that piece.' Mr. Jay put the same question on the other two picees, and received the same answer. He then said, you may withdraw. As soon as I was gone, John Penn, of North Carolina, moved that 'Thomas Paine be discharged from the office of Secretary to the Committee for Foreign Affairs,' and prating Gouverneur Morris seconded the motion, but it was lost when put to vote, the States being equally divided. I then wrote to Congress, requesting a hearing, and Mr. Laurens made a motion for that purpose, which was negatived. The next day I sent in my resignation, saying that, 'as I cannot, consistently with my character as a free man, submit to be censured unheard, therefore, to preserve that character and maintain that right, I think it my duty to resign the office of Secretary to the Committee of Foreign Affairs, and I do hereby resign the same.'

"But I still went on with my publications on Deane's affairs, till the fraud became so obvious that Congress was ashamed of supporting him, and he absconded. He went from Philadelphia to Virginia, and took shipping for France, and got over to England, where he died. Dr. Cutting told me he took poison.

"However, I prevented Deane's fraudulent demand being paid, and so far the country is obliged to me, but I became the victim of my integrity."

Paine made it so hot for Deane that he left the country because of the intensity of public feeling against him, etc.

It appears that Mr. Paine was accustomed to attend the sessions of Parliament before he left England, and listen to the discussions, which, no doubt, Junius frequently did, in order to keep posted on what transpired in that body. He says: "I remember taking notice of a speech in what is called the English House of Peers, by the Earl of Shelbourne, and I think it was at the time he was Minister, in which he said, 'That the form of Government was matter wholly at

the will of a Nation, at all times; that if it chose a Monarchical form, it had the right to have it so, and if it afterwards chose to be a Republic, it had a right to be a Republic; and to say to a King: 'We have no longer any occasion for you.' "

Junius and Paine were in hearty accord with the Earl of Shelbourne in his doctrine, while Francis was not; he was a staunch royalist, and at that time was in the employment of the Government, as a Clerk in the War Office.

My readers have, no doubt, observed that Mr. Paine frequently uses the word "hath" for "has." I regard it as a kind of *idiom*, peculiar to the Quakers, and, quite naturally, young Paine contracted the habit from his father of using the word "hath" for "has." Junius very rarely used this mode of expression. I conceive that he had a motive for not doing so. It might have betrayed his identity, which he strenuously endeavored to conceal. His near friends and classmates would probably have detected him, by this peculiar manner of expressing himself, and have traced him to his Quaker origin, and, in this way, have discovered his identity with Junius. But Paine as Junius, had no such motive for not using the word "hath" in his writings, after he came to America, as none of his old friends or classmates were here; he was among strangers, and had no fears of detection from strangers. No doubt, he used the word "hath" in his writings, in America, partly because it imparted a kind of euphony to them, and a certain novelty in America, which helped to give tone and prominence to his pamphlets.

Lest I tax the patience of my readers, I will not attempt a recapitulation of the many instances of similarity and sameness, which I have shown to exist between the writings and characteristics of Junius and Paine, but will refer to only a few of the more prominent examples above mentioned.

Their sententious and epigrammatic style of expression; their searching interrogations; their beautiful metaphors;

their caustic sarcasms; their bitter irony; their cruel invectives; their apposite antitheses; their rhythmic mode of expression; their unity of purpose to be accomplished; their hatred of a Monarchy and oppression, and their love of a Republic and liberty of the people, all conspire to prove the fact that Junius and Paine were identically the same person —of course we must take into consideration the circumstance that the Junius Letters were written in London, and Paine's pamphlets "Common Sense," were written in America, but both of them were directed against the same King, Ministry and Parliament, under a somewhat different condition of things.

I have omitted to state one fact and argument which naturally weighs very considerably in favor of Mr. Paine as a writer, when compared with Mr. Francis. It is the difference in their respective ages when the Junius Letters were begun August 10, 1768. Paine was born on January 29th, 1737, and Francis was born on October 22nd, 1740; therefore Paine was nearly four years older than Francis at the time when the Junius Letters were begun, which we all know, gave him much more experience, much greater knowledge and much more maturity in mind and thought than Francis possessed, who was nearly four years younger than Paine. Francis was in his 28th year, and Paine was in his 32nd year, when the JUNIUS LETTERS were commenced. Francis was too young to have written them. Paine was fully young to have been the author of these remarkable letters.

During the year 1786, Paine completed all he had to do in America. The war had been ended, and peace restored. An exemplary government had been formed, in all of its departments, with a model Constitution which incorporated all of the thirteen Colonies in one whole, under the name of the United States of America, in all of which he actively participated. Then, like Junius, when he had finished his labors in England, as far as it was possible for him to do, again "Othello's occupation was gone," and he turned his thoughts to some other country for the exercise of his genius.

On the 16th day of April, 1787, he sailed for France, where the Revolution was in progress, and witnessed the taking of the Bastille. The subsequent year, Edmund Burke, then England's greatest statesman, wrote his "Reflections on the French Revolution," in which he treated the subject at great length, and censured it very severely. Paine was particularly conservative on the plan to abolish the French Monarchy, and replace it with a republican form of government, because he feared that radicalism would be a bad example to set before the people. Soon thereafter, Mr. Paine returned to England, and wrote an answer of 270 pages, called "The Rights of Man," to Burke's "Reflections," in which he vigorously combatted his arguments, strongly advocated a republican form of government, and bitterly denounced a Monarchy, especially England. This was one of the ablest documents which ever came from his pen. He almost demolished the arguments of Mr. Burke. History says that one hundred thousand copies of the "Rights of Man" went into the hands of the people. Everybody read it with profound interest. It carried consternation to the King, the Ministry and the Parliament. Immediately the Government took it up. Many persons were fined and imprisoned for publishing the work, and Mr. Paine was prosecuted, tried and convicted as the author, by a violently prejudiced judge and jury, and an order for his immediate arrest was issued, but having been elected as a representative to the National Assembly of France, by the Department of Calais, he hurriedly left England in September, 1792, and never returned. Within half an hour after his departure from Dover, Paine would have been taken into custody, carried to London and probably been confined in the Tower for life. Although he had escaped a grave misfortune, yet, he had a great and perilous work before him, as a member of the National Assembly of France, where he co-operated in the overthrow of the Monarchy, and the establishment of a Republic in its stead.

On taking his seat in the Assembly, he made a short address, outlining the trials and troubles ahead of them,

in order to achieve their independence, and enjoy the priceless blessings of liberty. Mr. Paine was one of nine men appointed by the Assembly to draft a new Constitution. Charges were soon brought against King Louis XVI and he was brought to trial; he was found guilty and condemned to die. This was a sore trouble to Mr. Paine, and he used all his arts of persuasive oratory to prevent the King from being executed; but advocated "Killing the Monarchy, but sparing the Monarch," and suggested that he be exiled and sent to America to be held there, where he would be kindly treated. Paine had not forgotten that this same King, at his and Col. Laurens's request, had lent to America $2,500,000 when she was struggling for her independence against the tyranny of Great Britain, and which secured her the victory.

This noble act sounded Paine's death-knell in the Assembly. He was looked upon with suspicion by such radicals as Marat and Robespierre. Soon after, an order was made by the Assembly, that all foreign-born members should be expelled, and that all persons born in England, should be imprisoned, which included Paine; and he was, by order of Robespierre, arrested and thrown in the Luxembourg prison, where he was confined for nearly a year. It is without the scope of this book to go into details of what happened during the "Reign of Terror" in France. The reader will have to consult history for that. However, I will relate some circumstances which appertain personally to Mr. Paine, and are germane to my subject. Here is what he says, very much abbreviated: "There were but two foreigners in the Convention, Anarcharsis Clootz and myself. We were both put out of the Convention by the same vote, arrested by the same order, and carried to prison the same night. He was taken to the guillotine and I was left. One hundred and sixty-eight prisoners were taken out of the Luxembourg prison in one night, and one hundred and sixty of them guillotined the next day, of which I know that I was to have been one, and the manner I escaped that fate is curious, and has all the appearance of accident. When persons, by scores and hundreds, were to be taken out of prison for guillotine,

it was always done in the night, and those who performed that office had a private mark, or signal, by which they knew what rooms to go to, and what number to take. We were number four, and the door of our room was marked, unobserved by us, with that number in chalk; but it happened, if happening is a proper word, that the mark was put on when the door was *open*, and flat against the wall, and thereby came on the inside when we shut it at night, and the destroying angel passed by it. A few days after this, Robespierre fell, and the American Ambassador arrived and reclaimed me, and invited me to his house. The Americans in Paris went in a body to the Convention to reclaim me, but without success."

While in prison, he was seized by a violent fever, which came very near ending his life, but he attributes his escape from the guillotine to his serious illness, in part, as he was too low to be moved, when others were taken. He was out of his mind for nearly a month, during which time Robespierre fell, which fact was the first thing communicated to him. About a week after this, Mr. Monroe arrived from America, to supersede Gouverneur Morris, as Minister to France, and two months thereafter Paine was liberated, through the efforts of Mr. Monroe, who took him to his home, where he was a guest for some time; when, by a unanimous vote of the Convention, he was invited to resume his seat in that body, and which he did for a while. Had the Convention, while Robespierre was in power, listened to Paine's conservative advice, France would have been spared much cruelty and suffering; the "Reign of Terror" would never have been inaugurated; and she would have enjoyed a permanent republican form of government.

After quitting the Convention, he occupied himself in writing very important works, some of which were: "A Dissertation on the First Principles of Government," "Agrarian Justice Opposed to Agrarian Law" and to "Agrarian Monopoly." Also "The Decline and Fall of the English Government."

He was detained longer in France than he desired, owing to the fact that he could not get safe passage to the United States. He made several efforts, but found that England had officers on the look-out, to make his arrest. Finally he found a safe opportunity, and sailed for America on September 2, 1802, after an absence of fifteen years.

After his return, he led a very quiet and retired life, most of the time using his pen to good purpose. But his health was greatly impaired from his imprisonment in the Luxembourg prison. In America he was welcomed by many of the best citizens and officers of the Government, especially DeWitt Clinton, Governor of New Jersey, and Mr. Jefferson, then President, who received him "With joy and gratulation." "A large public dinner was held in his honor," "and other demonstrations of joy at his return were evinced in New York." Paine's financial circumstances were very good. He owned the estate at New Rochelle, New York, besides other property, of which he wrote his friend Clio Rickman: "My property in this country has been taken care of by my friends, and is now worth 6000 pounds sterling; and will bring me 400 pounds sterling a year." He wrote a series of very able "Letters to the Citizens of the United States of America, after an absence of fifteen years," seven bitter letters against the Federal Party, and many others.

Naturally, Paine made many political enemies in the course of his aggressive writings. Most of his attacks, like those of Junius, were directed against the nobility of England, consequently they contributed everything in their power to detract from the influence of Paine, and the efficacy of his voluminous and powerful works. He, as well as Junius, was a true friend of the people, whom the Government of England was systematically oppressing, and they, in turn, were the friends and admirers of Paine and Junius. Paine and Junius evidently came from the humbler walks of life. They were real prodigies of human nature, whose like has not been seen since their day and time.

They both wrote under an assumed name and concealed their identity most carefully, in which they had the same

motives: Junius to escape arrest and punishment in England, and Paine in America. Both entertained the same ideas on government; they hated a monarchy and strongly advocated a republican form of government. Both employed the same style, thought and subject matter in their writings; which is apparent on a comparison of the Letters of Junius with the Pamphlets of Paine; they have the same kindred features, which betray the same paternity. They had the same friendships and animosities; they were loyal to their friends and implacable to their enemies. They preserved the same dignity and gravity in their writings, and never indulged in the least levity. They were punctilious on questions of truth and honor, and never departed from either. They both led secluded, simple and economical lives, and avoided all public notoriety. They were exceedingly secretive in all their relations of life, and resented any inquiry into their private affairs. Both refused to accept any emoluments from their public writings, but let all go for the benefit of the *cause* which they espoused. Both were comfortable in their financial matters, and contributed liberally to advance the interests of the *people*. Their associates were among the plain people, and they eschewed the society of would-be aristocracy. Both had fair educations, to an extent, classical. They were well read and informed, had full command of the English language and were fair Latin scholars. Both were bold and fearless in their writings, and were not actuated by any motive of policy.

I conscientiously believe that I have adduced abundant evidence to prove that Francis was not the author, but that Thomas Paine was the real author of the JUNIUS LETTERS.

If any of my readers wish to challenge any position which I have taken in this controversy, and will write me, I will take pleasure in endeavoring to answer him. Possibly, I owe my readers an apology for elaborating this discussion so much, but I conceive it to be incumbent upon me to strengthen every redoubt which an ambitious critic might attack.

In conclusion of the disquisition of this subject, I will tender my thanks to those who have followed me through the discussion of this intricate question; and, if my efforts shall merit their approbation, I shall feel amply repaid for all the pains I have taken, in my search after truth, to prove my contention, that Thomas Paine was the real author of the Junius Letters.

I beg the reader to remember that Thomas Paine contributed in every way in his power, to secure the independence and liberty which we are now enjoying. Let us forget his few errors, and remember his many shining virtues. "To err is human, to forgive is Divine."

In final conclusion, I will add a few original lines, expressing my idea of the perpetuity of his name:

No marble shaft, or storied urn,
Need mark his resting place;
His works perpetuate his name,
Which time cannot efface.

ESTO PERPETUA.

THE AUTHOR.

Birmingham, Ala., 1916.

DA 508 .P3 G7
Junius finally discovered,
Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 041 372 819

DA
508
P3G7

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-1493

All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

28D APR - 9 1996

MAR 2 0 1996